THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

VOL. XXXV, No. 3 JULY, 1928

Revelation Through John	Asa E. Goddard	257
Swedenborg and Revelation	William H. Beales	270
Modern Fundamentals	Louis A. Dole	283
Revelation and Evolution	William W. Cutler	295
Is God a Force or a Person?	Arthur Stones	308
Science and Religion [A Review of two books by Henry Nelson Wieman]	Lewis F. Hite	319

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

Convention LEWIS F. HITE - - - - - - - - 340
The Church of the Second Coming WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - 347
Bible Translations and Translation WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - 354

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

A Digest of the Teaching on "Charity" (I)
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - - - 356
The Lord's "Glorification" OTHMAR TOBISCH - - - - 363

Current Literature :

Alfred Acton's "An Introduction to the Word Explained"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - - 370
Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx's "A History of the Jewish People" FREDERIC R. CROWNFIELD - - - 374
Arthur John Gossip's "The Galilean Accent"
WM. L. WORCESTER - - - - - - - - - 376
Frank J. Scribner's "Portion for the Children"
JEDEDIAH EDGERTON - - - - - - - - - 377
E. Boyd Barrett's "The Jesuit Enigma" B. A. WHITTEMORE - 378

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXV.] JULY, 1928 [No. 3

REVELATION THROUGH JOHN

BY ASA E. GODDARD.

SWEDENBORG in "Heaven and Hell," n. 254, says:

I have been informed how the Lord spoke with prophets through whom the Word was given. He did not speak with them as with the ancients, by an influx into their interiors, but through spirits who were sent to them, whom He filled with His look, and thus inspired with words which they dictated to the prophets; so that it was not influx, but dictation. And because the words came forth immediately from the Lord, they are each filled with the Divine, and contain within an internal sense, which is such that angels of heaven perceive them in a heavenly and spiritual sense, when men perceive them in a natural sense: thus the Lord has conjoined heaven and the world by the Word . . . . The spirit filled with the Divine from the Lord knows not otherwise than that he is the Lord, and that it is the Divine that speaks, and this even until he has done speaking. . . . Because such was the state of the spirits who spoke with the prophets, therefore also it is said by them that Jehovah spoke.

Again in "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 959, he says:

The Word, which was dictated by the Lord, passed through the heavens of his celestial kingdom, and the heavens of His spiritual kingdom, and thus to the man through whom it was written; wherefore the Word in its first origin is purely Divine. This Word, as it passed through the heavens of the Lord's celestial kingdom, was Divine celestial, and as it passed through the heavens of the Lord's spiritual kingdom, was Divine spiritual, and when it came to man, it became Divine natural.

From the above and similar passages every New-Churchman believes, of course, that all parts of the Bible which have the internal sense by pure correspondence are equally holy, since they are all the Lord's Word; and some of us have given very little thought about who wrote any particular portion, inferring perhaps that it made very little difference since it was all *dictated*. But was not the Lord's choice of writer in the case of John at least a part of His gift to us; and may we not receive help and inspiration by a study of some of the marked characteristics of his writings, and a consideration of his character?

Turning again to Swedenborg, we learn:

> All revelation is either from speech with angels through whom the Lord speaks, or from perception. Only those in the good of love to the Lord have the latter. Very many, even those not in good, have the former, also in visions and dreams. Most of the revelations of the prophets of the Jewish Church were through speech without perception, or by visions or dreams. Genuine perception comes through heaven from the Lord, and affects the intellect spiritually, and leads it perceptibly to think as the thing really is, with an internal assent, the source of which it is ignorant of. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5121.)

> Because John represented this good [good of charity or love] the revelation was made to him; for revelation out of heaven, such as this, can be made only to those who are in the good of charity or love. Others indeed can hear the things that are from heaven, but they cannot perceive them. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 8.)

> The good of love was what the Lord saw when He beheld John. That good is what constitutes heaven and the church. (Ibid., n. 9.)

Isaiah, filled with the spirit of the Lord, writes "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth (lxv, 17); Peter with unwavering faith says, "Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth (II Peter iii, 3); but John alone can say, "I *saw* a new heaven and a new earth (Rev. xxi, 1). Isaiah prophecies: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting

Father, The Prince of Peace" (Is. ix, 6). It was John's privilege not only to see and to be with this Son as His most intimate and beloved disciple during His ministry on earth, and to see Him and to listen to His words of wisdom after the resurrection, as the other disciples also did, but to have his spiritual eyes opened to the most convincing evidence that the same Lord whom he had loved in the world now rules, and forever will rule, both heavens and earth with His infinite love. He *sees* the fulfilling of the prophecy in Zechariah: "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one" (xiv, 9), when the beautiful visions of Revelation appear before him, and he hears the voice of "one like unto the Son of man" declaring "I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death" (Rev. i, 18). And again: "He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS" (Rev. xix, 6). And still again, and even more plainly, the voice through the angel says: "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star" (xxii, 16).

While the purpose of this paper is to consider some of the distinctive features in the writings of John which give a peculiar interest to every New-Churchman, let us not for a moment consider this as in any way a disparaging of any other portion of the Word. It is all Divine, all of it equally beautiful in its deeper meanings, some of it equally beautiful in the letter. The wonderful accounts of the Annunciation, the birth, early childhood and youth of the Lord are lacking in John. There is no Sermon on the Mount, no parables, no model prayer given us. Only two of the miracles recorded by the Synoptists are mentioned by John; the others given by John are found in that Gospel only. Even the Transfiguration, so fully described in the other three Gospels, is entirely omitted in John—the only one of the four writers privileged to be present at this wonderfully beautiful

and impressive vision. And yet, as one reads this fourth Gospel dictated to the beloved disciple, does it not seem that the whole book is in a sense a transfiguration? Moses and Elias have faded from the view; Jesus stands alone in His glory. In a very literal, as well as in a deeper, sense, He is the "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last" of the Gospel. Its whole purpose is declared in the close of the twentieth chapter:

> And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name.
> (xx, 30, 31.)

The first sentence in Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," has been described as the sublimest passage in all literature; but it is closely paralleled by the opening words in the Gospel of John, going back of creation to the Life that created and still creates, to the Life that became flesh and dwelt among us, and is forever the "Light of the World." In this Gospel we have the testimony of John the Baptist, then of Nathanael, then of the twelve disciples through Peter, and in many places the words of the Lord Himself, to prove that He is the Son of God. "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent" (xvii, 3). The Lord calls Himself "man": "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God" (viii, 40). He is the Son of man as the giver of "that meat which endureth unto everlasting life" (vi, 27). He is the "only begotten Son of God" (iii, 16) sent for the salvation of the world. Finally, as the days of His glorification are drawing to an end, He completely identifies Himself with the Father: "I and my Father are one" (x, 30). "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (xiv, 97). After the resurrection the disciples no longer call Him Master, but Lord, even the unbelieving Thomas exclaiming "My Lord and my God" (xx, 28). We are left

with a perfect picture of the Divine Humanity. Everything inherited from the mother has been put aside and replaced by a Divine body, the creation of the Divine soul or Father within. He is "Emmanuel, God with us," proclaiming "I am the way, the truth and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me (xiv, 6).

How this Divine Humanity is still with us, and will remain with us till the end of time, is also plainly taught in John:

> In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters. (But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.) (vii, 37-39.)

> If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless [orphans]; I will come to you. (xiv, 15-18.)

> But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. (xiv, 26.)

> It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, *I* will send him unto you. (xvi, 7.)

> Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I that He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you. (xvi, 13-15.)

The Father sends the Comforter, and Jesus sends the

Comforter. The Lord tells us that the Comforter will come, and almost in the same breath "I will come"; that the Comforter is the Spirit of truth, or the Holy Ghost, who will guide us into all truth, at the same time He is the Heavenly Father who will not leave us orphans. He says of the Holy Ghost: "He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine. . . . All things that the Father hath are mine." The Trinity is complete in one, as we learn in I John, v, 7: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." (Let us compare this statement of John, the apostle of the New Church, with the declaration of Peter, the apostle of the Catholic Church: "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv, 12); and with Paul, the apostle of most of the Protestant Churches: "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii, 9).

It is interesting to follow through our New-Church creed, and see how fully that belief is founded upon the Gospel of John. When we come to the sentence "He endured temptation even to the passion of the cross," how delicately, and yet with what depth of feeling, this truth is brought to our minds in the intensity of the prayer:

> Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name. (xii, 27-28.)

> These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world. (xvi, 33.)

> Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? (xviii, 11.)

Noble's "Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures" (London, 1825) brings out so beautifully the contrast in the accounts of the Lord's crucifixion and last words from the cross that we will quote in full:

Matthew and Mark give in detail the cruel insults heaped upon the Savior, and describe the bitterness of His temptation and the severity of His mental and bodily suffering, and record the despairing exclamation "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Luke states much less of the aggravating scoffs, and narrates nothing to indicate that the Lord's own sufferings engaged much of His attention; but on the way to execution He says to the mourning women, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children." Instead of any exclamation of despair upon the cross, we have "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit"; and these words, together with the encouraging declaration to one of the thieves, and a prayer for His murderers, were the only words recorded by Luke as spoken from the cross. How plain then is it that Luke relates the perceptions and feelings of Jesus on this occasion as they existed in a sphere of His mind above that the sensations of which are recorded by Matthew and Mark; with the words which He spoke from this different order of sentiments! And still more is this the case with the narrative of John. This seems to describe His feelings in a sphere of His mind to which no consciousness whatever of His indignities and sufferings reached. It therefore does not at all notice the insults addressed to Him on the cross. He is represented as occupied with no considerations whatever which regarded Himself. To represent His care of the church, which ever dwells with those of whom the disciple whom He loved was a type, "He saith to His mother" in reference to that disciple "Woman, behold thy son"; and to the disciple, who thenceforth took her to his own home, "Behold thy mother." To express His ardent desire for man's salvation, and "that the Scripture might be fulfilled", He exclaimed "I thirst." And as far from indicating any feeling bordering upon despair, He does not even express any sense of needing support: He does not, even in appearance, refer to any Divine Helper out of Himself; but, experiencing already a perfect consciousness of His union with Divinity, and "knowing that all things were now accomplished" necessary to effect that union, and with it to secure the redemption of mankind, He simply, and with Divine composure, says "It is finished." (Pp. 586, 589.)

In order that we may appreciate, so far as our finite limitations allow, the sufferings endured by the Lord, it is necessary for us to read and meditate upon the accounts of the earlier Gospels; but what a wonderfully brightening and uplifting experience it is to feel that the Lord's last thoughts

upon the cross were for the salvation of men and the care of His church, in the full consciousness that His earthly mission was now accomplished! "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" (I Cor. xv, 55).

The closing sentences in our creed show a striking contrast between the old "faith alone" doctrine and the New-Churchman's belief that salvation depends upon our active coöperation with the Lord not only in keeping the negative Commandments, but with special emphasis upon the distinctively Christian life of service and love. Here again we turn to John for the foundation of our faith:

> Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples (xv, 8.)

> A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another (xiii, 34-35.)

This new commandment is found only in John, and it is given three times with a somewhat different setting in those final tenderest of all messages to His disciples. It is a corner-stone of a new theology. "The Lord knows as a father a son those who are in the good of love and charity" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6806). For such there is no longer a God to be feared. The Divinely-human sentiments of sympathy, friendship, and love of a Heavenly Father pour in unlimited measure into the hearts of all who "open the door." He weeps with the sisters of Lazarus; He calls His disciples friends; He makes His abode with those who respond to His call.

> Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you (xv, 14-15.)

> If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him (xiv, 23.)

"That the Lord is present with all, He teaches in Matt. xxviii, 20, and that He makes His abode with those who love Him, in John" (Divine Wisdom, III). The words "abide" and "abode," occurring so frequently in John, are found in no other Gospel in a purely spiritual sense, and are a most convincing evidence of the Lord's continual presence and loving care.

Other words and expressions, such as "light," "eternal life," etc., as used in John, afford an interesting study; but let us pass to a brief consideration of a few of the great essentials of a Christian life.

The necessity for regeneration is taught in the beautiful symbolism so common in John: "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit [truths from the Word and a life according to them], he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (iii, 5). And again in His humble service in washing the disciples' feet, He says to Peter: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me" (xiii, 8). And then, as if to emphasize the new commandment so soon to follow, and remind us of our part in the process of regeneration, He adds: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet" (xiii, 14).

One of the greatest essentials in the process of regeneration is dependence upon prayer. No fixed form is given us in John, but the whole seventeenth chapter is the Lord's own example of a perfect prayer; and in other places He not only proves its efficacy in His own life, but promises that *our* prayers, if made in the same spirit, will always be answered. The Lord prayed before He raised Lazarus, and added "Thou hearest me always" (xi, 42).

> If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it (xiv, 14.)
>
> If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you (xv, 7.)
>
> Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full (xvi, 24.)

The account of the Holy Supper, found in all the synoptists, is given most fully and beautifully in Luke; for here

we have the added exhortation of a loving friend, "This do in remembrance of me" (Luke xxii, 19), and the expression of the Lord's own ardent desire to eat the passover with His disciples (ibid., xxii, 15). While John makes no record of the breaking of bread and passing the cup, yet it is through him that the Lord reveals the inward meaning of this most sacred act of worship. In the sixth chapter He feeds the five thousand, but tells those who followed simply for this earthly food "Labor not for the meat which perisheth" (vi, 27); and then in answer to their demand for a sign, referring to their fathers' feeding upon manna, He says:

> Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. . . . I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst (vi, 32-35.)

It was this discourse that repelled the materialists of that day, and led to the Lord's question to the twelve, "Will ye also go away?" Peter's answer will forever ring in the ears of every sincere communicant, "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life" (vi, 68).

In connection with Swedenborg's statement, "The Lord is present in His fulness as to the Divine in the Holy Supper," it is beautiful to see how this is confirmed in the five chapters of John (xiii-xvii) immediately following its observance. He reveals Himself in a way nowhere equalled in all the Scriptures in tenderness of love. He was among the disciples "as he that serveth," washing their feet, and bidding them wash one another's feet. They are no longer servants, but friends; and He lays down His life for His friends. He is the vine, and they are the branches, and the branch that abideth in Him "bringeth forth much fruit." He teaches them to pray, and promises unlimited power in answer to their prayers. He leaves them His peace, and shares with them His joy; "and your joy no man taketh

from you." He closes with that wonderful prayer that they may be kept from the evil, be sanctified through the Divine truth, and dwell in the warmth of the Divine love.

The Apocalypse, while containing much that is mysterious to the average layman, at the same time contains some of the most practical truths requiring frequent meditation. The Lord knows our works both good and bad, encourages us in the former, and urges repentance for the latter, and promises abundant reward for all who overcome. Even to the inactive and self-satisfied Laodiceans is given the message: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (Rev. iii, 20). The importance of these messages to the churches is emphasized in later chapters also where judgment is treated of:

> And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works (xx, 12.)

> He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still (xxii, 11.)

In those periods of depression which are wont at intervals to come over us both as individuals and as a church, let us remember that the seed of the woman prevails over the dragon of falsity and the Babylon of self-love and lust for dominion, and that the rejoicing heard in heaven, "Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ" (xii,10), is in time to be echoed by the church on earth. "He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son" (xxi, 7). John, the beloved disciple of the first coming, is the Lord's own choice as the bearer of His message of the second coming, "Surely I come quickly"; and the glad response of the church in the language of a rejoicing bride, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." It is no mere accident that the Gospel of John, the gospel of love, is placed as the

culmination of the four gospels, and that the Book of Revelation marks the close of the Lord's revealed Word, and ends with His benediction.

Because of what John represented, as carrying out in actual loving service the Lord's will, he could be elevated even to the third heaven, see there in symbolic form the new Christianity of love, and be directed by Divine influx to express it in correspondential language in the Book of Revelation. That was inspiration in its highest form. So, too, was his inspiration when he revealed the true nature of the Lord in the Gospel, much of it in the Lord's own words to the disciples. We have already alluded to another form of inspiration in the case of the prophets of the Jewish Church. But this, too, is a verbal inspiration, and there is a connected spiritual sense. It seems fair to compare John's inspiration in writing his Epistles with the inspiration of Paul, and account for the great differences, both in subject matter and manner of treatment in these writings, as differences naturally arising from the different types of character of the two men. Swedenborg tells us:

> Paul indeed spoke from inspiration, but not in the same way as the prophets, to whom every single word was dictated; but that his inspiration was that he received an influx according to those things which were with him, which is quite a different inspiration, and has no conjunction with heaven by correspondences (Spiritual Diary n, 6062.)

In the Epistles of John, then, we may expect to find not that inexpressible quality characteristic of the purely Divine Word, which makes us feel that we are in the presence of the angels; but we shall receive a message on the highest human plane from one who from long experience in walking in the path of life has lost all desire to deviate from it. John as a representative character was intrusted with the life-giving messages of the Gospel and the Revelation; as an historical character he is an embodiment of the practical application of those doctrines in his own life, and his words speak to us with peculiar power.

That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life. . . . declare we unto you. (I John i, 1-3.)

This is the true God and eternal life. (Ibid., v, 20.)

For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments: and His commandments are not grievous. (Ibid., v, 3.)

If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. (Ibid., i, 9.)

He that doeth the will of God abideth forever. (Ibid., ii, 17.)

Let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth. (Ibid., iii, 18.)

Let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. (Ibid., iv, 7, 8.)

And whatsoever we ask, we receive of Him, because we keep His commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in His sight. (Ibid., iii, 22.)

These are the voice of peaceful old age, calling "Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what He hath done for *my* soul."

Let us close with our thoughts upon the meaning of the word "John" as "The Gift of God"; and let us thank our Heavenly Father for this wonderful gift, and for His manifold gifts to the whole Christian world *through* the Apostle John.

Asa E. Goddard.

SWEDENBORG AND REVELATION.

By the Rev. William H. Beales.

THE WORLD is in possession today of a system of doctrinal teachings such as it never before knew. Of the magnitude and grandeur of those teachings nothing need be said at this time. Those most familiar with it realize how little they know compared with how much there is to learn. It is beyond all question the most profound system of teaching regarding spiritual things ever revealed to man, with the one exception of the Word Itself. It is truly the "crown" of all former revelations; and upon it as upon a foundation is being built throughout Christendom that Church which will never pass away, but will go from glory unto glory, for it is the Lord's "New Jerusalem."

We know that these teachings were given to the world through the instrumentality of Emanuel Swedenborg. We accept his statement as true, when he declares solemnly that they were revealed to him "by the Lord alone." But the question naturally arises: What does he mean by this statement? Did he hear the Voice of the Lord speaking to him, and telling him, directly and explicity, what to write? If not, just what does he mean when he says that the doctrines of the New Church were revealed to him "by the Lord alone?"

Let us realize at the outset that there was nothing "miraculous" about this enlightenment of Swedenborg. The Lord always works in an orderly way; and we shall see, I am convinced, that the enlightenment of Swedenborg was brought about, in general, in the same way as that of every earnest seeker after the truth of spiritual things. There is no secret, there need be no mystery, about it. It is true that there was an unusual combination of circumstances or

factors connected with Swedenborg's enlightenment; but there was no departure from the basic principles underlying all enlightenment in spiritual things.

The starting-point of our study is that oft-repeated statement found in the Writings, that "doctrine must be drawn from the letter of the Word," the "Word" in this instance meaning the inspired books of the Bible. This, I take it, is the basic principle from which there can be no departure: that the written Word is the one means provided by the Lord for making genuine doctrine known to mankind. The whole structure of Swedenborg's enlightenment rests upon that foundation. Indeed, he makes it very clear himself that this is so, for he declares that the "heavenly doctrines" were revealed to Him "by the Lord alone," *while he, Swedenborg, was "reading the Word."*

Now, when we turn to the Writings, we see at once that there was no departure from the orderly enlightenment of mankind. Every man who reads the Word in sincerity and with an earnest desire to be lead by the Lord, is enlightened "by the Lord alone" while he reads the Word. One passage from the "Arcana" makes this clear:

> Be it known that all doctrine of the church must be from the Word, and that doctrine from any other source than the Word is not doctrine in which there is anything of the church, still less of heaven. But the doctrine must be collected from the Word, and while it is being collected, the man must be in enlightenment from the Lord, and he is in enlightenment when he is in the love of truth for the sake of truth. These are they who are in enlightenment in the Word when they read it. . . . The reason is, that they communicate with heaven, thus with the Lord; and being enlightened by the Lord in this way, *they are led to see the truths of the Word such as they are in heaven,* for the Lord inflows through heaven into their understandings, because it is the man's interior understanding that is enlightening. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9424.)

Here, then, seems to be the teaching regarding enlightenment as to doctrine: the doctrine itself is contained in the Word, and must be drawn from it by man. When anyone earnestly seeks this doctrine in the Word, he is

enlightened by the Lord Himself, and is thus enabled to understand what he reads as it is understood in the heavens. Thus he is able to draw genuine doctrine from the Word.

We have thus two factors which combine to bring about enlightenment as to doctrine: the reading and study of the Word; and an "inflowing" from the Lord into the man's interior understanding. We readily perceive the first; but just what is to be understood by the second? What is the nature of this "inflowing," and what part does it play in bringing about "enlightenment"?

As I read the Writings, this "inflowing" is what Swedenborg calls, in other places, "immediate influx," and is the descent of the "Divine Truth" from the Lord It is called "immediate" to distinguish it from that "mediate" influx which descends to man through the heavens and the world of spirits. Without attempting to analyze the expression "the Divine Truth," we may, I think, say this about it: that it is *not* an influx of *knowledges* or doctrinal teaching. All these are supplied by the letter of the Word. It is really a descent of an inner *light* which shines upon the knowledges and teachings derived from the Word. A passage from the "Spiritual Diary" helps us to understand the nature of this "inflowing" from the Lord. We read:

> Understanding is from the light of heaven, which is from the Lord, in which light is wisdom and intelligence, for that light is from Divine Truth proceeding from the Lord. Hence from this light exists thought, discernment, reflection, attention, prudence, rational analysis, and the faculty of judging, distinguishing and choosing. All these exist from light, because they are of internal sight. Wherefore, whatever a man hears, passes over into that light in order that it may be perceived. (Spiritual Diary, n. 4527.)

This teaching is illustrated by Swedenborg in another place, where he draws an analogy between physical and spiritual sight. We are surrounded by many objects in the world—trees, houses, men and women, and so forth. High above is the sun. Now, were it not for the sunlight, all the objects which surround us would be invisible to us. The

sunlight does not provide or add anything to these objects, but only shines upon them, and thus enables us to see them; and by our sight we then distinguish between trees and men, know the relationship between them, and understand their true nature. So with the understanding, which, after all, is spiritual sight. In the mind there are "objects" which correspond to the things we see around us in the world. These "objects" are knowledges. We gather them together but would never know anything about them, that is, would never understand their true nature and relation each to the other, but for the immediate influx from the Lord. This inner light, as we read, actually gives us the faculty of "judging, distinguishing and choosing"; and from it actually exists "thought, discernment, reflection, prudence and rational analysis." The knowledges themselves upon which the inner light is thrown, the *facts* regarding spiritual things, come to man by "mediate" influx, by an outer way; and the power to truly understand and arrange those facts or knowledges comes by an inner way; and these two, "mediate" and "immediate" influx, meet in the mind of man, and he is enlightened regarding spiritual things.

We have already seen that the information or knowledges of spiritual things are to be found in the letter of the Word. From these must all true doctrine be drawn, and upon these must it rest. But we are faced with the fact that the Word is a difficult book to read, and that much of what is contained therein seems foreign to the subject of spiritual knowledges. Is it not a poor medium for the imparting of a knowledge of spiritual things? Yes, and no. Let us keep the whole situation in mind. The purpose—the *one* purpose of the Word is to impart those knowledges which shall be the foundation of true doctrine regarding spiritual and Divine things. Does the Word fulfil that mission? Most certainly. While it is true that there are portions of that Book which, when read in the letter, seem to have nothing whatever to do with imparting such knowledges, yet it is also equally true that in other parts the Word is

very clear as to the *essentials* of religion—i. e., the doctrines necessary for the salvation of man. We read in the "Apocalypse Revealed": "All things that belong to the life of man, that is, to his salvation, are bare [in the Word], but the rest are clothed; and in many places where they are clothed they shine through, as the face shines through a thin veil." In other words, the Lord has so provided that all *essential* doctrines are clearly revealed in the letter of the Word, and can be read and understood by the most simple. The knowledges upon which all essential doctrine must be founded, and from which it must be drawn, are to be found clearly taught in the letter of the Word. Thus the Lord has provided the "mediate" influx without which a knowledge of true doctrine is impossible.

To all who seek this knowledge in the Word, the Lord conjoins the "immediate" influx. He does not, however, as I understand it, grant any further *knowledges* than those imparted by the letter of the Word; but He does give the power to understand what is read, to reason about it, and to perceive what is true in it. Thus from those parts of the Word which are bare, every sincere man and woman is able to draw the genuine doctrines which are necessary for his or her salvation. The extent and degree of these doctrines, however, must always be limited by the extent and degree of the knowledge of the letter of the Word. Enlightenment depends entirely upon the conjunction of the two kinds of influx—"mediate," from an outer way, and "immediate," from the inner way. Thus while no one who sincerely reads the Word is left without some degree of enlightenment "by the Lord" while reading the Word, the *degree* of enlightenment depends upon that person's knowledge and understanding of the letter of the Word.

This being true, we begin to see the necessity for a "special" revelation of doctrine through Swedenborg? The time had come when men must have a fuller and above all a *rational* understanding of genuine doctrine. Men did, indeed, possess a knowledge of the essential doctrines of a

spiritual life—the knowledge that there is a God, that He is a God of love, that man must shun evils and do what is good, and that salvation comes from the Lord alone; they had a knowledge of these things, but had also mingled with these simple, clear teachings many false doctrines which had, to a large extent, destroyed a right understanding of even these simpler teachings. The Church had laid down the doctrines whereby the Word was to be read and understood, so that men did not "draw doctrine from the Word," but went to the Word with doctrine already formulated by the Church, and merely confirmed those false doctrines by means of the letter of the Word. By the mercy of the Lord, men still had a sufficient knowledge of genuine doctrine for their salvation; but a great mass of false doctrine had been built up which could only be cleared away, and the simpler doctrines restored to their rightful place, by the imparting of new knowledges which would supplement and help man to a better understanding of that one basis of all true doctrine—the Word.

Moreover, the time had come not only for a restoration of a true understanding of the parts of the Word which are "bare" or "thinly veiled," and from which can be drawn the "essential" doctrines, but also for the imparting of knowledge which would enable man to uncover a wealth of doctrine concealed in those parts of the Word which are clothed in symbol and correspondence, and also—most important of all perhaps—*to understand all doctrine rationally*.

Prior to the Second Coming of the Lord, in the unfolding of the spiritual sense of the Word, the Church did indeed have the essential doctrines, as already stated. But, there was little, if any *rational understanding* of those doctrines. Take, for example, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. Whatever men may think of that doctrine today, it is most clearly taught in prophecy in the Old Testament, and most definitely stated as a matter of history in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. The Church in the past has read those Divine messages and accepted them as true. Enlightenment

descended from the Lord into the minds of those who read, and gave a perception that they were true. But, while believed, they were not rationally understood. That doctrine was believed because it was so stated in the Word, and because men accepted the Word as a Divine Revelation. But times have changed. Men today must have a *rational* basis for their beliefs. They are examining the teachings of the Church and of the Bible in a way never before attempted; and because they cannot find either in the teachings of the Church or in the mere letter of the Word any *rational* basis for the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, they are rejecting it in a surprisingly frank and open manner. They are not doing so because they do not want to believe that teaching, but because they cannot see any *reason* for believing it. The age of "blind faith" has passed.

Now the revelation which is the basis of the New Church appeals directly to the reason. Sometimes we are tempted to think that it does so at the expense of the affectional appeal. Be that as it may, it is a fact that New-Church teachings provide man with material for a *rational* understanding of all the doctrines taught in the Word, including that of the Virgin Birth. Thus they lift the whole matter of doctrine up to a higher plane than mere acceptance on authority; they lift it to the plane of the spiritual-rational.

How was this brought about? Remember, the revelation of Swedenborg does not bring to men any *new* doctrine, that is, any doctrine not previously present with men in some form. It only restores the teachings of Christ and the Old Testament, and draws from the Word additional doctrines already existing in that Book, but until the time of Swedenborg concealed from the eyes of men. The doctrines of the New Church are all in the letter of the Word; they have been there since the written Word first existed. The mission of Swedenborg was to re-state those doctrines already uncovered, reveal others which have lain hidden, and give to all a rational basis for acceptance.

In order to bring this about, one thing was obviously

imperative. *The letter of the Word must be intelligently understood from cover to cover.* "Doctrine must be drawn from the letter of the Word." All but the simpler and essential forms of doctrine lie concealed beneath a covering of symbol and correspondence. That covering must be stripped off. Means must be provided for the imparting of that fund of knowledge or fact which is the basis of the "mediate" influx, in order that the "immediate" influx from the Lord could find something in the mind of man to which to be conjoined.

In this need for a true understanding of the letter of the Word we have the real reason for Swedenborg's "other world" experiences. They were not, as some have supposed, granted merely to enlighten mankind as to the nature of the spiritual world; their real purpose, as I understand the subject, was to lay the necessary foundation for a right understanding of the letter of the Word. Without those "other world" experiences, Swedenborg could never have understood the Science of Correspondences; and without a knowledge of the Science of Correspondences, he could never have understood the true nature of the Word and uncovered the spiritual sense; and without the knowledge of the spiritual sense of the Word, he could never have drawn from that Word the genuine doctrines of the New Church.

Swedenborg was to learn the wonderful relation between the natural world, in which we all live consciously, and the unseen spiritual world, in which we all live unconsciously. He was to look beyond the world of mere effects into the great world of causes. He was to see beyond the passive world, the world of reaction, into the active world, the world of action. He was to see how the Divine life descends from the Lord, and passes through the heavens and the world of spirits, ultimately bringing into being upon the material plane all the glories of creation and preservation. He was to see the relation between the soul and the body, and that larger, higher relation,—the relation between the

Lord and man. He was to see before his eyes the operation of that marvelous law which connects cause and effect, spirit and matter, and thus brings all things upon earth into being. He was to rationally understand the greatest of all laws, the "Law of Correspondences."

Why was this necessary before doctrine in its fulness and purity could be drawn from the Word? Because the Word Itself is written according to this Divine Law. Spiritual things are expressed in the terms of their natural correspondences; and a knowledge of the relation between spiritual and natural things had to be understood before the outer covering of the Word could be removed, and the spiritual teaching revealed.

Therefore we see the need for the wonderful states of "preparation" through which Swedenborg passed before he was finally able to draw the clear doctrines of the New Church from the Word. First he was introduced into the natural sciences in a way which was, and ever will be, truly marvelous. It was necessary for him to know, as no one man ever knew them before, the laws which are operative on the natural plane; for such knowledge was required to serve as a foundation for higher knowledges to come. Then he had to acquire the quiet, orderly, unimpassioned mind of the true philosopher, so that he could reason about what he learned, and not be carried away by prejudice or emotion. Then, most important, he must have his mind freed from all preconceived ideas of religion or doctrine; not, of course, to have his mind made a blank, but to hold his judgment in abeyance as to the truth of all theories, while having a wonderful knowledge of them, so as to be free to go to the Word with no taint of theological bias, whether derived from the teachings of the Church in his day, or from his own preconceived opinions,—complete "emptying out," as it were, of all beliefs before room could be made for the truths of the new revelation. This was one of the most important of all Swedenborg's preparatory experiences. He himself ex-

presses these experiences in many of his private papers, one of which will suffice here. He says:

> I have discovered that I know nothing on this subject [of religion] except that Christ must be all in all, or God through Christ, so that we cannot, ourselves, constitute the least of it. Wherefore it is best to surrender, and were it possible to be altogether passive in the matter, it would be a state of perfection. I saw, also, in a vision, how some beautiful bread was presented to me on a plate. This was a prediction that the Lord would instruct me as soon as I have attained to that state in which I know nothing, and in which my preconceived ideas shall be removed from me, which is the first state of learning; or, in other words, that I shall first become as a child, and then I shall be able to be nurtured in knowledges, as is being done with me now. (Journal, nn., 266-7.)

Time will not permit enlarging upon this aspect of Swedenborg's preparation. Perhaps the Church has overlooked it too much in the past, for it throws a flood of light on the method and nature of his enlightenment. This much should be said: that he passed through temptations, bitter struggles and sore trials, in thus being "emptied" of self, such as perhaps no other man ever endured. He had pride of intellect,—and not without abundant reason, as reason for pride goes; yet this was humbled and rejected by him after long and bitter fighting. Possessed of a mind and knowledge surpassed by no man, he yet attained to the humility of a child. Never will the world know fully the experiences through which he passed before he was fully prepared for his mission.

It was when the scientific, the natural-rational, and above all the spiritual-rational planes were opened and filled with a store of knowledges, that Swedenborg was fully ready to receive the doctrines of the New Church—or rather, to fully expound them in their completeness. It was thus that he was prepared to write his last great work, the "True Christian Religion," which is the crown of all his former writings, and which deals specifically with the doctrines which are the very foundation of the New Church. This, as I see it, was the very heart and soul of his mission—to

make known the doctrinal truths upon which the New Church must be built. This it was towards which all else was leading. And when this was done, then his mission as "seer" of the New Age, or, as he so simply puts it, as "Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ," was completed.

Now we can return to our first inquiry with the hope of finding a rational answer. How was Swedenborg enlightened as to the doctrines of the New Church? Not by the audible voice of God, but by that inner descent of Divine Truth into his mind which the Lord grants to every earnest reader of the Word; by the immediate influx of Light into a mind stored, as no mind had ever before been stored, with knowledges regarding spiritual things, all gathered by the outer way of the senses, physical and spiritual. The knowledges were there, gathered during years of experience such as no man ever had before. And when the proper time came, the Light descended from the Lord, immediately into his mind, enabling him to see the relationship of those knowledges one to the other; their significance; their value; and, above all, the true significance and meaning of what was written in the letter of the Word. It was the combination of this wonderful fund of knowledges (gained by years of study on the physical plane, and by years of experience in the spiritual world, as a reasoning, intellectual being) and of the Light of Divine Truth descending immediately from the Lord and shining upon that knowledge, that enabled Swedenborg to do what no man had ever done before,—draw from the letter of the Word the true doctrines of religion, as they are understood and accepted in heaven. It was in this way, and in this sense, I take it, that Swedenborg would be understood when he declares that the doctrines of the New Church were revealed to him, not by any angel or spirit, "but by the Lord alone, while reading the Word."

One other thought. Swedenborg seems to have experienced a wonderful feeling of confidence and certainty, when striving to put these doctrines into form, that what he wrote

was true. Even when struggling with scientific knowledges, and seeking to draw conclusions from these, he experienced an inner conviction that he was right. At times, he tells us, there appeared a wonderful light, which convinced him that his conclusions on that particular matter were correct. This light often appeared to him during the writing of his theological works, convincing him that he was working along the right line. "Flamy lights were seen by me," he asserts, "confirming what was written"; and many times, when making an important statement, he adds, "These things are true, for I have the sign." This aspect of Swedenborg's experiences may not appeal to the world at large; but it carries great weight, once the nature of influx is understood.

In conclusion,—is there anything to prevent any earnest student from drawing the genuine doctrines of the New Church from the Word in the same way that Swedenborg drew them? We cannot talk of "impossibilities" where God is concerned; but neither must we lose sight of the fact that there is a law governing these things, and that it expresses Divine Wisdom. Doctrine is not poured into the mind as water is poured into a pitcher. It is the result of "immediate" influx from the Lord shining upon such things from the letter of the Word as are read and understood and believed. Where the Word is looked upon as mere human literature; where it is read as merely a record of the lives and times of its human authors, together with their personal experiences and the experiences of other human beings; where it is accepted as that sort of production, and that alone, it is difficult to understand how genuine doctrine can be drawn from it, excepting those simpler teachings which appear in the "bare" sections of the Word. A right knowledge of the letter of the Word is absolutely essential to all true "enlightenment" as to spiritual things; and where that knowledge does not exist, there can be no true enlightenment. In the case of Swedenborg, a lifetime of preparation, and experiences such as no other man has ever passed through since the beginning of creation,

were necessary before he was able, by the mercy of the Lord, to draw forth those doctrines. He must be raised up into the highest heaven, while still a citizen of this earth, to behold the action of the Divine Life there; he must explore the farthest reaches of the world of spirits; he must descend into the depths of the hells, to behold the "presence of the Lord" even there; and all this, not because he was either angel or devil, but a man "prepared by the Lord" for that purpose. Should the Lord ever prepare another human being as Swedenborg was prepared, then we might indeed look for doctrine to be drawn from the Word as Swedenborg drew it; but not otherwise. Without such preparation the very foundation for enlightenment is lacking. It certainly seems reasonable to assume that, for the present at any rate, the world is, and must continue to be, directly or indirectly dependent upon the Writings of Swedenborg for those teachings which provide a rational understanding of religion; although just to what states of spiritual development mankind may attain in the future, no one can say. And this much we can say with confidence: that no matter to what heights men may attain in the ages to come, nothing will ever supplant the doctrines or principles revealed in the Writings. They are the eternal truths of the Eternal God; and while men will surely go forward to all eternity understanding them more and more fully, and finding greater and greater depths of meaning in them, and fuller and fuller delight, they will always remain, as they are today, the foundation truths of the Lord's "New Jerusalem."

Wm. H. Beales.

MODERN FUNDAMENTALS

By the Rev. Louis A. Dole

TODAY, for perhaps the first time since its acceptance by the Roman Empire, Christianity as a religion is openly questioned within its own ranks. Instead of being regarded as a necessary means for the salvation of civilization and of the race, it is actually denounced by many as the cause of all the ills in history from the downfall of the Roman civilization to the unstable condition of our own. In addition to such sweeping indictments, we hear on all sides charges against the existing Christian Church and its members: incompetency, stupidity, bigotry, hypocrisy. It is hardly necessary to undertake an apology for Christianity here; but there is one point in the line of defense where, it seems to me, the morale is almost universally weak. Any sincere Church member, realizing his own weaknesses and how far short of the ideal his organization comes, is liable to be thrown off his balance and to accept not only charges which are true, but also charges which are false, and to jump at any measures that are suggested, without due consideration of the facts and of the principles involved. This is particularly true of the young people, who are by their very nature immature, easily fired with enthusiasm, impatient of delay, and intolerant of failure. Much of the disparagement of creeds and of the deliberate shunning of doctrine is due to this cause.

Superficially it seems logical to say: the Church is for all men; its mission is the salvation of the individual; therefore the Church should draw in the individual at all costs; whatever in the Church offends anyone should be abolished. One person says that he does not come to our Church because he does not like the formal service; another, that

the sermons are too doctrinal; another, that we are too "otherworldly" for him; another, that he can't swallow Swedenborg. The natural tendency of the thoughtless is to urge that we change our ways on all these points because we are keeping people away, without considering whether the Church is right or wrong in its observance, or rather arguing that anything in the Church which offends anyone is necessarily wrong. They seem to forget that many were offended in the Lord.

It comes down to a question of what the Church is, what is its mission, and what things are fundamental to the accomplishment of this mission.

The Church has many aspects, such as the church universal, the church specific, and the church in the individual, and so on, all of which need definition. What people usually mean by the Church when they make charges against it is, the Church as an organized body of individual men and women; and it is this aspect which I have uppermost in mind in this paper.

The most common and most insistent criticism of the Church is, that it is not one body, but many antagonistic groups competing against each other; and the effort for Church unity—prominent today under the spur of the attack on Christianity—has its justification in the promise of the Gospels that there is to be one fold under one Shepherd. The history of the Christian Church is the history of the effort to bring not only individuals but groups under the rule of the Lord. We pray: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, as in heaven so upon the earth." This cannot be granted in a moment, but only as men come into agreement as to what the Lord's kingdom is, and what His will is.

One of the leaders in the modernist wing of the Protestant Church recently wrote: "It is not membership in this organization or that; it is not the acceptance of this theological statement or that; . . . these things vary like the color of men's eyes, hair, and skin." This is a character-

istic statement, and is a tacit assumption that acceptance of one or another creed, or membership in one or another denomination, is entirely immaterial to the Christian life. This may be popular doctrine, but that does not make it true. The minister who adopts this platform may fill his church, but he is not really advancing the cause of Christianity. For Christianity, if it is anything, is a specific doctrine of life. Honest disagreement as to what this doctrine is may, under present conditions, be inevitable. Such disagreement is deplorable, but disagreement is much better than indifference. The divergence in religious belief today does not imply that, as no two groups agree, acceptance of one or another is immaterial. If all theological statements were equally true or untrue, this would be a complete and final solution of the problem. But if there is one body of theological statement which is truer than all others, then membership in the body is not a matter of indifference: it may be a matter of spiritual life or death. We cannot with impunity shirk the responsibility to seek the best, and to choose the best. Indifference here, as elsewhere, is dangerous.

These facts have been given immediate pertinence by the recent conference at Lausanne. This was the last of several conferences, all inspired by the desire for Church unity. Their order is interesting: first, the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910; second, the "Copec" Conference on Christian Politics, Economics, and Citizenship, at Birmingham in 1924; and third, the Life and Work Conference at Stockholm in 1925, "whose purpose was to concentrate the thought of Christendom on the Mind of Christ as revealed in the Gospels towards those great social, industrial, and international questions which are so acutely urgent in our civilization." The Lausanne Conference in 1927 was called to investigate questions of Faith and Order. This series of conferences is significant as indicating the direction in which the minds of men are led when they seriously and honestly consider the problems

of Church unity. The point at which the need for unity is most acutely felt is in the mission field; and the level on which the basis of unity is first sought is in the field of the individual external life. But these conferences discover the need of studying the teachings of Christ which bear upon the group life; and finally it is found necessary to study the doctrinal differences of opinion as preliminary to any constructive efforts toward unity.

From this point of view, the Lausanne Conference was wisely conceived, and it accomplished its purpose. The effort was to get a clear formulation of the points of agreement and of difference in the Christian world. It is significant that the recognition of the Deity of Jesus Christ was taken as a test of Christianity, the invitation to participate not being sent out to churches which definitely reject this tenet. This greatly simplified the problem. Several charges made against the Conference have been dealt with in a simple and straightforward way by Dean Edmund Davison Soper of Duke University in his book "Lausanne: the Will to Understand." The principal charges were: that the Conference did not accomplish anything, as it took no steps toward unity; that the delegates could not partake of the Communion together; and that the young people and laymen were not adequately represented.

All these charges are met, reasonably it seems to me, by the reminder that the Conference was called for the specific purpose of getting at the facts, and with the understanding that the delegates would not be committed to any promises or to taking home any recommendations for action. It was a Conference for investigation and not for action. In regard to the Communion, it became evident at once that one of the chief points of difference was as to the mode of celebration and validity of the Sacraments. This difficulty should not be charged against the Conference. It is unreasonable to expect the delegates from the various churches to do at one meeting what their churches had refused to do for centuries. The fact that the Conference focussed the atten-

tion of the world upon this failure of the Christian Church to be able to partake of the Lord's Supper together, should be counted as in itself an important accomplishment. And, in regard to the third charge, naturally the great majority of the laymen and young people would have been out of their field at a conference on doctrine. When the question of Church unity is thus driven back to the study of doctrine, the responsibility must rest chiefly with the clergy.

Dean Soper himself sums up the results of the Conference as follows:

> These reports certainly show that there is a deep line of cleavage in organized Christianity. It starts with the definition of the central doctrine of the Church, and extends out to the very extremities of Christian life and thought. We found, it is true, that we were united far more deeply than we had anticipated; but the differences were brought into almost sharper outline. If these differences could keep us apart with so much binding us together, they must be very significant and very wide.

Dean Soper, who was himself a prominent delegate, very honestly quotes many adverse criticisms of the Conference, not only from the press but from delegates and observers at the Conference itself. All these criticisms are based on the assumption that doctrinal differences are not real differences, and that they should be swept aside entirely, so that the Church may get together along lines of so-called practical work. It is the old familiar saying: "It does not matter what you believe." Every one of the charges, when analyzed, is based upon the desire of the individual to have the Church do what he thinks it should. Very often these are matters upon which the laymen and the youth are divided, as well as the ministry; for instance, prohibition, the abolition of war, the League of Nations, and such current issues. The fact is that the individual church organizations, to say nothing of the Church as a whole, are united on scarcely anything even on the plane of morals. An outstanding example of this disagreement is the question of marriage and divorce; this question alone, if pressed, would split the Church.

The Lausanne Conference, however, discovered some points on which they thought all could unite. It is significant for us as New-Churchmen to note that with several of these points the New Church, which as usual was not invited to the Conference, would take issue. In spite of the claims that the old doctrines have gone and that the New-Church teachings have really permeated the denominations, the Conference not only agreed upon their acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, but specifically voiced their united belief in a trinity of persons in the Godhead, and their belief that the passion of the cross constituted redemption. These two fundamental errors persist. In "Coronis," n. 22, Swedenborg writes:

> The belief that the passion of the cross was redemption itself is a fundamental error of the Church which, together with the error concerning the three Divine Persons from eternity, has perverted the whole Church.

The doctrines which perverted the Church and developed in it an intolerant individualism would not seem to afford a very hopeful basis for union.

The report of the section of the Conference on the Unity of Christendom was brought in so late that no action could be taken upon it. It outlined six points upon which there must be agreement before union could be hoped for:

1. A common faith, a common message to the world;
2. Baptism as the rite of incorporation into one Church;
3. Holy Communion as expressing the corporate life of the Church and its signal act of corporate worship;
4. A ministry accepted throughout the universal Church;
5. Freedom of interpretation about sacramental grace and ministerial authority;
6. Due provision for the exercise of the prophetic gift.

It takes very little thoughtful consideration to realize that the achievement of a united Church on this basis, if possible at all, is a matter of many generations; but the fact that such a report was formulated by representatives of

over seventy autonomous organizations is an indication that it is futile to minimize the importance of doctrinal differences. The series of conferences showed clearly that none of the actual problems of Church unity are solved by merely saying "We are all working for a common purpose," and that a united Church can be built only upon a common faith.

All religion has relation to life; and Christianity as a religion is a mode of life. In its source and origin it is the life that was lived and made manifest in Christ; and the Christian looks to it as the most perfect vision and goal. For the individual, Christianity is the personal experience that comes from following Christ. The individual, however, does not live to himself or by himself. There are as many different Christian experiences as there are individual Christians; but there must be a body of common experience in order to give private experience reality and meaning, and in order that the individuals may work together as an effective organization. This common experience is the goal of Christian effort. The Church is the neighbor in a higher degree.

The individual life is effective in proportion as it works intelligently toward a definite goal; and the same is true of the group. So long as the goal is hazy, and the effort toward it is carelessly directed, little progress can be made. "One fold under one Shepherd" implies that all the sheep recognize the same Shepherd, and follow Him in the same direction, however they may browse individually along the way. The Lord teaches us also that, although the fold is a universal one, it is a fold enclosed by walls, with one Shepherd and with one legitimate entrance. If a sheep goes astray, it is to be brought back to the fold; not to have a new fold built for it wherever it may happen to be.

To pass to Paul's metaphor: "We being many are one body in Christ." Here the Church is pictured as one body, the individuals being its members. This is a striking example of the type of unity which the Church should have. As the body has but one brain and is completely subservient

to it, so the true Church can have but one doctrine of life. Or, to put it in terms obnoxious to many, there must be a creed, and there can be but one true one. Until men can come into real agreement as to what that creed is, there can be no united Church. This is true of the individual Church organizations of today, as of the greater Church of the future. In so far as the individual does not wholeheartedly accept the creed of his Church, he is bound to interfere with its effective working. So-called liberality, when it means vagueness as to belief, is a hindrance and not a help to the Christian Church. Men can work together only so far as they agree.

The Church, considered as a body, is more than the sum of its members. We are accustomed to think of this simile because our social life is in part organized in this way. Our great commercial and industrial organizations exemplify this characteristic of group life. In them many work together for a common end under the direction of one head. Any organized group is an entity with a life of its own. We speak of the "mass mind," of "public opinion." This gives to the community a mind of its own which is not the exact mind of any one individual in it. We also speak of nations as being young, old, or decadent. A nation acts as an individual: one nation can deceive another; it can drive an unjust bargain; it can fight a neighbor; it can exploit or enslave a weaker nation; or it can exert its powers for righteousness and peace. And in all its acts, it exerts more power for good or evil than an individual. People have learned to unite for the accomplishment of great undertakings. Many acting together can do what an individual cannot do, and what a multitude acting separately cannot do. And in the results of the group achievement the individual shares. He derives much from it; he is protected and enriched by it. In working in it and for it he finds his opportunities and his happiness.

So the Christian life is a life to be lived not merely by individuals but by groups. Just as the industrial and the

commercial life reach their highest expression and effectiveness as they become completely organized and co-operative, so religious life must find expression in a completely organized Church if it is to attain its destiny. Christianity is more than a personal religion; it is a social religion. This makes it imperative that men be organized to carry out the Lord's will. Nothing less meets the needs of men; nothing less can save mankind. Membership in the Church is essential. The field of social or group life is the only field which gives a sufficiently wide and effective scope for the practice of Christian virtues. An invisible Church, unless it works out in the form of a visible Church, is an abstraction. The Christian life is, in its least form, received by individuals; but individuals are interdependent, and Christianity can find adequate expression only in the organized life of mankind. This is the task of the New Age, for the accomplishment of which the charter of a universal faith has been given.

The common faith upon which a united Church can be built will not be a compromise faith. It must be the one true faith. Only the truth with regard to God and man will survive the intellectual attacks of successive generations. It is a widespread belief today, especially among Protestants, that no one branch of the Church has or can have the whole truth and nothing but the truth. This sounds like liberal-mindedness and humility, and it is of course a fact if we mean by "the whole truth" everything of the truth that can ever be known; the truth in this sense is infinite. If, however, by "the whole truth and nothing but the truth" we mean a universal principle which is a comprehensive summary of all truth, and which must be in each and all truths of the system, to say that no Church has or can have "the whole truth and nothing but the truth" means that there is no sure foundation upon which a Church can be built. Doubt is not good building material. Swedenborg did not find positive statements inconsistent with humility before the Lord; nor did he refrain from making them for fear of

retarding his mission. For example, we read the following:

> Let it be known that in the New Heaven, which the Lord is now establishing, this faith is its preface, gate, and summary.
>
> The Faith of the New Heaven and of the New Church in its universal Form is as follows:—
>
> The Lord from eternity, who is Jehovah, came into the world to subjugate the hells and to glorify His Human; and without this no mortal could have been saved; and those are saved who believe in Him.
>
> This is called the faith in its universal form, because this is the universal principle of faith; and the universal principle of faith must be in each thing and in all things of it.

If we believe that this is the truth faith, we should uphold it as a matter of duty to the Lord and to the world, and lose no opportunity to make it known. For it should be evident from the results of the Lausanne Conference that the world has not after all appropriated Swedenborg, or even considered the claims of the New Church. The faith of the New Church is a universal faith. This means that it starts at the center, and can work out into all the fields of human thought and endeavor without breaking under the strain. To make such an assertion for the New-Church faith is neither bigotry nor self-satisfaction; for bigotry is blind adherence, and the New-Churchman's satisfaction is not with himself; he does not look upon his doctrine as something of which he is the author, but as a revelation from the Lord, made to all the world, which answers the questions of mankind in such a way that they can follow it as a sure guide. It requires no closing of the eyes of the mind, nor any word quibbling. The New-Churchman does not think that he is perfect, nor that his understanding is perfect; but he does believe that the fundamental truths concerning God and man have been revealed through the Second Coming, and that this body of truth, when interpreted and applied to life, will establish the New Jerusalem.

The interpretation and application of the doctrines have their personal aspects, as the conditions and needs of the individual members of the Church vary; but here again we

must bear in mind that it is group experience which validates individual experience, and that the doctrines as social doctrines require common interpretation and application. When one argues from personal experience alone, it may justly be answered that his experience is perhaps unique, resulting from his peculiar mental make-up; but when he argues from the ground of common experience, he must be heard. This is to say, that such individual interpretation, when it is at variance with common interpretation, should be carefully examined and laid on the table for further consideration. If it is valid, it will improve with age; if not, it will at least have done no harm. The Church as an organization must advance on the basis of common interpretation and application to life.

As an organization, the Church can prosper and do its work effectively in the measure that its members accept the direction of its teachings. Whenever individual members belittle its teachings, rebel against them, or seek to evade them, there is immediately constituted a diseased spot in the body, from which infection may spread, and which inevitably interferes with the proper growth of the body and with its usefulness in the world. "No man can serve two masters." If we think more of the approval of the world than we do of the service of the truth, we set up a house divided against itself. What we need is humility before the Lord, not humility before the world. So long as Israel persisted in worshipping the gods of the nations round about, it was defeated by them in battle.

The modern world cannot accept the fundamentals as proclaimed by the denominations—that is, their central doctrine concerning God and salvation. On the other hand, the modern world will not long respect any Church which does not supply it with positive teaching about the Lord and man's relation to Him. The outcry against creeds is paralleled by another cry: "Why is the Church trying to compete with various secular activities instead of giving us religion?" Our mission is to proclam the message of the

Second Coming by both word and deed; that is, by a life organized both individually and collectively upon its teachings.

The New Jerusalem is a *new* Church for a new Age. The fundamental requirement of the New Age is that "it have a faith which is tenable, and which can be at the basis of all true knowledge in its internal aspects." It is the new idea of God that will make the Church of the New Age. The Heavenly Jerusalem has indeed twelve gates, but they are all of one pearl, and they all lead within the walls.

LOUIS A. DOLE.

Revelation and Evolution

By William W. Cutler

DURING the last few years several editorials and articles, all by prominent ministers of the New Church, have appeared in the New-Church Review, the common purpose of which seemed to be to insist on the deep-seated opposition between creation as understood in theology and evolution as described by science. Opposition was particularly expressed to the confident assertion of evolution as a fact; that is, "the evolution of plants and animals in a continuous series by generation from the simplest organic forms to the highest and most complex, from amœba to man."

The attempt was made to lay a scientific groundwork for their rejection of evolution as a fact by reciting the many difficulties, which have been pointed out by the scientists themselves, in the way of accepting biological evolution. From this the discussion shifted to the theory or doctrine of evolution, denoting by this some such materialistic view of the universe as was expressed by the Rev. Chauncey Giles when he wrote that "the essential principle of evolution is that matter has no origin, and that it contains within itself all the substances and forces, and all the organic forms and qualities of plants, animals and men." It is abundantly clear that evolution in this last sense is entirely antagonistic to the idea of creation as expressed in the theological writings of Swedenborg.

But to return to the fact of evolution; for it is in this, and not in a materialistic metaphysics that has often been based upon it, that believers in revealed religion who consider themselves evolutionists are interested. When we speak of evolution as a fact, we mean that it was a course

of actual occurrences that might have been observed provided an observer had been present during the period long or short, during which one species was developing from another. Now all this happened in the distant past, for there is no recorded instance of a new species appearing in historic time. Thus evolution, if it is a fact, is not a directly observed fact, but an inferred fact. Our belief or disbelief in this fact must depend on inferences drawn from observed facts. But that is true of all our knowledge of the prehistoric past as given to us by archæology or geology or astronomy. We believe the fact to be, that the English race and the Persian race are chiefly descended from an original Aryan race which once lived somewhere in Eastern Europe. That is not a matter of direct recorded observation, but an inference from many facts.

In the proof of any fact, whether in a law court or in the wider field of science, it is a matter of the weight of evidence. From a consideration of the accumulated evidence one may come to believe that the earth is round, that an individual is descended from certain parents, or that one species is descended from another. These are facts of the outer world of a similar order; but the evidence in the one case may be more convincing than in another. To some, these may be proved facts; to others, probable facts; or to still others, unproved facts or mere assumptions. These have to do with things or events that are believed to exist, or to have happened, in the outer world; and they have nothing to do with theories, or explanations, or causes. It is a question of the *what*, rather than of the *how* or the *why*. That the fact of evolution may not be completely verified in the judgment of some, does not change the problem into a "philosophical postulate," as seems to be the contention made in one of these articles. The problem is still one of science, and not of philosophy or of religion.

The position taken in these REVIEW articles, that the evidence is insufficient to establish evolution as a fact, is certainly a possible one. On the other hand it must be

remembered that the scientists, who have been so industrious in the accumulation of evidence, and have studied it so carefully, would seem to be the most competent judges of its weight; and they are practically a unit in believing the fact of evolution, although there is a wide diversity of belief among them as to the method or process or natural laws by which it is brought about. Le Conte probably represents the attitude of scientists today as truly as he did a generation ago, when he wrote:

> We are confident that evolution is absolutely certain. Not indeed evolution as a special theory—Lamarckian, Darwinian, Spencerian—for these are all more or less successful modes of explaining evolution, . . . but evolution as a law of derivation of forms from previous forms; evolution as a law of continuity, as a universal law of becoming. (Evolution and Religious Thought, p. 65.)

True, the contention is made, that if the evolutionist knows nothing of the process of evolution, he knows nothing of evolution as a fact. But surely the present prevailing view is not illogical or unreasonable. Take the illustration of the descent of the English race from the ancient Aryan race. The evidence may be perfectly convincing as to that fact, but it may be utterly deficient in explaining how or when or where the English race separated from the parent stock, or why the English race has its present qualities and habitat, and not those of the Persian race, or of some other descendant of the same Aryan stock. The details of the descent may be obscure, while the fact of descent is undeniable.

While the writers of these REVIEW articles all seem to be convinced that they are rejecting evolution as a fact purely on the basis of the insufficiency of the scientific evidence to support the same, some of them go on to buttress their conclusion with a discussion of numerous passages from the theological writings of Swedenborg. In one article the frank admission is made that there are "unmistakable difficulties" in interpreting these passages in connection with the idea of evolution; while another of the articles maintains

that in these same passages, or in similar ones of Swedenborg, the "inerrant truth" is to be found which "refutes the theory of evolution in all possible forms and adaptations . . . including the doctrine of descent, or that one species is derived from another by modification of function," and that there is "no essential point in the doctrine of creation that is not clearly and fully explained in Swedenborg's writings." But Swedenborg himself is more modest, for he states in one of the very passages quoted in part:

> But a full idea of creation or of the existence of all things in their order from the life which is the Lord is not possible, because of the arcana, which indeed are known in heaven and have been communicated to me; but as the subject is full of those things which lie deeply hidden in the *sciences*, it would require volumes to explain them, and even then would be scarcely comprehensible. (Divine Wisdom, XII, 5.)

The thought that it is desired to bring out and emphasize here is: Would not the writers of these articles on the weight of the evidence of science believe in evolution as a fact, just as the mass of educated people of today do, if it were not that they were influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by their feeling that somehow belief in evolution as a fact is in conflict with belief in the Christian religion, and in particular with belief in the revelation made through Swedenborg? Are they not using passages from Swedenborg to enable them to see the fact as they feel it should be, and not merely to interpret the fact after it has been established by scientific evidence?

If it is admitted that these writers and those taking a similar attitude are perfectly sincere in their belief that they are rejecting evolution on scientific grounds, it may be fairly asked: Why suggest that their religious views have probably been the controlling influence which has led to their rejection of evolution?

Is not the sufficient justification for making this suggestion to be found in the fact that almost invariably disbelievers in evolution are believers in revealed religion? In an individual case it is certainly not conclusive that the

disbeliever in evolution has become such because of his religious faith; but as to disbelievers in evolution as a group, it seems impossible to escape the conviction that their religious faith has been a deciding factor in creating their disbelief in evolution.

It appears that we have in these REVIEW articles good examples of an attitude maintained by a number of prominent leaders in the Church with reference to evolution which may be extremely unfortunate and harmful to the New Church. It seems to be reviving within our Church, whose distinctive belief is that the Bible was given to instruct in spiritual life and not in natural science or history, that conflict between religion and science which ought never to have been, and which is tending to disappear outside the New Church.

But after all, what have these numerous passages from Swedenborg quoted in these articles to do with the proof or disproof of the natural fact of evolution? These passages set forth a coherent doctrine of creation: that the seen is the product of the unseen; that God through the spiritual world has created the natural world. They present the inward point of view; and there is no necessary conflict with the doctrine of descent, the outward point of view, or the process as described by science.

In the "Divine Love and Wisdom," Swedenborg teaches that God creates by sending forth successive proceedings from Himself: first the spiritual sun and its atmospheres, each more and more remote from the Divine; and then the natural sun and its atmospheres; until at last inert matter was created, from which as an ultimate, or basis, or plane of reaction, and by means of it as a mediate or instrumental cause, successively higher living forms were created, ending with man, who could love and be conjoined to his Creator, thus fulfilling the end of creation. While the true cause of everything is in the spiritual world, Swedenborg shows that this does not conflict with an orderly progression or natural causation in nature.

Everything in the spiritual world is a cause, and everything in the natural world is an effect. Even *in the natural world one thing comes forth from another in progression;* but this is done through causes from the spiritual world; for where the cause of the effect is, there also is the cause of the effecting effect. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1206.)

Rather he asserts the natural origin; or that nature is the mediate or instrumental cause of the production of the higher natural forms from dead matter.

All those [heavenly] things are from a spiritual origin, and from no natural origin; the spiritual origin is life from the Lord. In correspondence with these, all things that appear in the natural world have been created; and for this reason like things exist there, with this difference, that these like the others are from a spiritual origin, *but at the same time from a natural origin.* This natural origin is added that they may be at the same time material and therefore fixed, and this to the end that the human race may be pro-created, which can be done only in ultimates, where there is fulness. (Divine Wisdom, xii, 5.)

In nature there are two *mediate* causes by means of which every effect, that is every production and formation there is accomplished. These mediate causes are light and heat. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1206.)

For things have existence [in heaven] by means of the forces of light and heat from the sun of heaven, which is the Lord, and *apart* from the forces that serve as substitutes and aids from the light and heat from the sun of the world. This is why matters in the lands of our globe are fixed, and the germinations are permanent; while the matters of substances in the lands that are in the heavens are not fixed, and consequently the germinations from them are not permanent. . . . The productions from (natural) lands are effected from the spiritual *by means of nature,* but in (spiritual) lands without nature. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1211.)

Everyone who is wise in heart can see that nature produces nothing from itself, but merely in the process of production *serves* the spiritual that goes forth from the sun of heaven, which is the Lord, *as an instrumental cause* serves its principal cause, or as a dead force serves its living force. (Ibid., n. 1215.)

No one could have gone further than Swedenborg in identifying the natural body of man with the animals.

Moreover in respect to the organs, members and viscera of the body, and in respect to their uses, *animal and man are wholly alike.* An animal, like a man, has eyes and thus sight, ears and thus hearing, nostrils and thus smell, a mouth and tongue and thus taste, also the cuticular sense with all its variations in every part of the body. . . . The likeness is such that *man in respect to these things is an animal.* (Ibid., n. 1197.)

These passages do not teach biological evolution in the modern sense, for that was not known to Swedenborg; yet, they seem in harmony with it, even to including man's body in the evolutionary process, a thing that especially awakens opposition among many believers in revealed religion. These passages certainly do not teach a doctrine of special creation of adults or even of seeds,—that God starts anew each time he creates a new species or form. Rather they indicate that He creates by means of mediates, or uses his previously created forms as instrumental causes.

The scientists as such are not trying to discover the cause of evolution in Swedenborg's sense of the word cause. They are merely trying to describe the process (or progression in nature, as Swedenborg calls it in the passages just quoted) as it might have been observed with our natural senses. It is this very progression in nature, or order in nature, that makes possible the sciences, or the ordered knowledge of the outward world and its happenings, and the discovery of natural laws which appear to govern or describe this progression. All this would be impossible if nature was a chaos. Natural science is based on the belief that there is an order in nature that can be discovered by systematic investigation.

Swedenborg makes many statements concerning revelation; and according to him its sole purpose is to make known spiritual truths. One of his frequent statements is:

Without revelation from the Divine men cannot know anything concerning eternal life, nor even anything concerning God; and still less concerning love to and faith in Him; for man is born into mere ignorance, and *must learn everything from worldly things* from which he must form his understanding. (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 8944, 10,318.)

The Divine out of love to the human race has revealed such things as may lead to that life and conduce to man's salvation. (Ibid., n. 10,320.)

The converse of this, that revelation is not given to make known natural truths or scientific knowledge, may not be so expressly stated; but it seems to be implicit in many of Swedenborg's statements. The first chapters of Genesis, which are part of the oldest revelation which we have, and which in its literal and most obvious sense state certain facts as to the process of natural creation, Swedenborg expressly tells us are not a true account of natural creation, but merely a parable to give us spiritual truths.

But who that takes into consideration the particulars of the description cannot see that the creation of the universe is not there meant, for such things are there described as may be *known from common experience not to have been so.* . . . From all this it is evident that the historical narrative of the creation and the first man and of paradise, is a history so framed as to contain within it heavenly and Divine things. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 8891.)

Swedenborg's writings do not reveal new natural truths or facts. He always assumes the science of his day, and uses it for purposes of illustration. (Cf. Apocalypse Explained, n. 1198, and Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 355.) Proctor, the astronomer, used as an argument against the validity of Swedenborg's claims the fact that in the "Earths in the Universe" he speaks of Saturn as the most distant planet, and never mentions the then undiscovered planets of Uranus and Neptune. But is this not rather in accord with his mission? He was not using his unique opportunities to make scientific discoveries, but to make known spiritual truths.

This fundamental distinction between the source of our knowledge of spiritual things, and the source of our knowledge of natural things, is very clearly stated by Swedenborg in a passage in "Heaven and Hell" where, in speaking of the man who has belief in the Divine, he says:

The man who is in that belief, and in a life that is in accord-

ance with his belief, has the ability and capacity to understand and be wise; but to become intelligent and wise he must learn many things, both things pertaining to heaven and things pertaining to the world—things pertaining to heaven from the Word and from the church, and *things pertaining to the world from the sciences.* (Heaven and Hell, n. 351.)

This has been the common understanding of Swedenborg in the Church. Rev. John Worcester, in his "Lectures," in speaking of Christ says:

It was no part of His mission to teach the science of the natural world. Nature herself was spread out before men; if they would not read her pages, how should they hear His word? Leaving to Nature to teach natural truth, He taught only of God and the life of heaven. (P. 21.)

Professor Parsons, in his "Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg," even more precisely states the distinction:

There are vital differences between spiritual and sensuous thought. One of these—that the basis of sensuous thought is sense, and the basis of spiritual thought is revelation. There is another of almost equal importance. Through all the work of sensuous thought the intellect alone is called to act. They who would think safely are careful to exclude from their thought all influence of feeling or affection; and that this must be guarded against is one of the rules for sound and just scientific inquiry. But for the higher mode of thought the rule is otherwise. (P. 11.)

Is it not just here that our anti-evolutionists have unconsciously departed from the "rules for sound and just scientific inquiry"? Has not their intense feeling and affection for the heavenly truths which they have found in Swedenborg's writings, led them to overlook his teaching that things pertaining to the world must be learned from the sciences? True the ever-increasing tendency of natural science seems to show that the natural universe, at least to outward appearance, is only a vast mechanism; and while natural science is rendering invaluable aid to man in his conquest of the material world, yet it has nothing positive to say as to a God or an inner world. Is this not just what

we should expect from Swedenborg's statements: that man can only learn of God and heaven from revelation; that there is a natural order or progression in nature that must be learned through reason and the senses, though the true cause is in the spiritual world? Thus the outer world is a valid field for natural science founded on outward observation. Its truth is shown by the fact that it works; but it is not the whole truth, for the deeper truths are supplied by revelation. So evolution as a phenomenon of the outer world is a matter for scientific determination without influence from revelation; but creation, its inward aspect, must be considered in the light of revelation.

Whether we accept the antithesis of "Creation or Evolution," or the phrase "Creation—An Evolutionary Process," depends largely on the definition of evolution. But is it not at bottom a question of point of view? Are we going to antagonize the results of natural science; or are we going to try to harmonize them with revelation? In one of the editorials first referred to, it is said in reference to creation and evolution, that "the lack of proper discrimination gives rise to a serious situation for the religious thinking of the day, and especially for the ready acceptance of New-Church doctrines." But do not our anti-evolutionists very much increase the seriousness of the situation, when they attempt to meet the naturalistic thinking of the day by denying or disputing the facts on which the theory of evolution is believed to rest; or when they so define their terms as to appear to make a conflict between science and the heavenly doctrines, when there is none? Evolution may be used in many senses; but why not prevent misconceptions, and use the popular meaning, the meaning it commonly has in the press, or to the man on the street. To the latter, evolution immediately suggests that man is evolved from the animal; or more broadly, the origin of species by descent. The materialistic metaphysics that it sometimes denotes is probably beyond his thought.

Will arguments for the old idea of special creation be

acceptable to a generation whose teachers are believers in evolution? Is the way to bring young people of our schools and colleges into the New Church to be found in maintaining that according to Swedenborg there is no such thing as evolution; to insist on an antithesis between creation and evolution; between Swedenborg and science? Such considerations may well cause our anti-evolutionists to pause and consider whether possibly they are not misinterpreting Swedenborg.

Further let it be admitted that the science of our day, as well as that of Swedenborg's day, is very imperfect; and many of its present facts and hypotheses will be proved false, or very materially modified. It is a constantly changing body of fact and doctrine. That evolution as a fact will be disproved in time to come seems improbable; but it is certain that the theories in regard to it will be profoundly modified. Past history would indicate that the science of the day has been far nearer the truth than have been the dogmas as to nature drawn from revelation by devout churchmen; that there is usually a large element of truth in each position of science; that the old view is never wholly false; and that with each new discovery a slightly nearer approximation is made to the ultimate truth.

Yet the conclusion seems obvious, that just as Swedenborg in his day illustrated and harmonized the spiritual truth he revealed with the imperfect science of his day, but without thereby putting a stamp of "inerrant truth" on such imperfect science, so now it is the clear duty of all his followers to try to harmonize that same spiritual truth with the science of today, a science that had advanced far beyond the limits it had in Swedenborg's day, but a science that, for all its certain limitations and errors, is doubtless a nearer approximation to the truth than was the science of the eighteenth century. Let us make clear to our inquiring young people that belief in evolution no more requires a giving up of revealed truth than belief in the rotation of the earth; that the belief that the individual

organism inherits qualities from its parents pursuant to Mendellian or other laws, or that one species descends from another species pursuant to unknown laws, no more than our belief that planets circle the sun pursuant to Kepler's laws, require us to give up our belief that

God's in His Heaven;
All's right with the world.

It is certainly the duty of our Church and of all churches to insist on the spiritual interpretation of the universe. It is undeniable that the age has a very materialistic trend. The wonderful results of scientific research are everywhere apparent. People have come to think that science comprises all there is of knowledge. The falsities of the old church stand out in more glaring relief. The result has been an alarming decline in faith in the unseen and eternal realities.

Everyone can share in the concern expressed in these articles in the materialism of the day, and be grateful for the service done in emphasizing Swedenborg's doctrine of creation, that the cause of everything of this outer world is from within. This doctrine certainly needs to be constantly reiterated in this sensuously-minded age, which is all the time forgetting its truth. Let it be conceded that we must be as loyal to the "inerrant truth" of revelation as was the church of old, when in good faith but mistakenly it maintained the literal truth of the Bible in the face of all the facts of science or of history; but let us be loyal with more intelligence, and always remember that any "inerrant truth" of revelation concerns spiritual truth, and that for natural facts Swedenborg always relied on the many wonderful things that had been observed in that kingdom by learned men and societies and recorded and on many other things which investigators had discovered and published in books (Apocalypse Explained, nn. 1197-8). Let us realize to the full the inestimable advantage we have in the knowledge of this discrimination that forever prevents any real conflict between revelation and science.

It is by this "proper discrimination," not by ignoring it, that the "serious situation for the religious thinking of the day, and especially for the ready acceptance of the New-Church doctrines" must be met. The modern mind will have nothing to do with any revelation, -the Word or the Writings,—if it is put forward as directly contradicting the testimony of the senses as rationally interpreted; but the simple in heart will, as in all ages, feel drawn to a revelation of spiritual truth, when it is put forward to interpret and supplement the testimony of the senses, and to give meaning and worth to life.

Man is a rational being, and now as ever desires to reconcile the seeming mechanism of the outer world with his inner hopes and aspirations. He will not long accept a denial of the one or the other. Somehow he feels that they are both but two aspects or revelations of one underlying reality; that beneath all is the everlasting Father. Is not the end of all revelation to implant, not natural facts, but this belief in the mind of every man, however sensuously minded? At first the man may be overwhelmed by the thought; but gradually it may take possession of him as it did of Browning's imagined Arab medical student, who after meeting Lazarus, wrote to his master an incredulous account of the miracle and of the claim of the miracle-worker, but could not forbear exclaiming in a postscript:

> The very God! think, Abib, dost thou think?
> So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving too—
> So, through the thunder comes a human voice
> Saying, "O heart I made, a heart beats here!
> Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
> Thou hast no power nor may'st conceive of mine,
> But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
> And thou must love me who have died for thee!"

William W. Cutler.

IS GOD A FORCE OR A PERSON?

By the Rev. Arthur Stones

MY subject is a very profound and important one. It is profound because it has to deal with the personality of God as far as we finite beings can know Him; and with the Operating Force of this universe. It is important because it has to deal with origins and ends or purposes in creation—thus with beginnings, designings, and sustainings. If I rightly understand my subject it will treat of Him who inspired one of His servants to write "In the beginning God created"; and Who, in a much later age, inspired another to write "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the Ending . . . the Almighty." Such high themes can only be briefly and imperfectly touched upon by me at this time.

May I begin by defining my terms? "God" is the Anglo-Saxon name for the Deity. It is said to be derived from the Icelandic word "goth" (deity), and its root is not known. Annandale says: "God is a being conceived of as possessing divine power, and therefore to be propitiated by sacrifice, worship, and the like"; "a divinity: a deity: the Supreme Being—Jehovah: the Eternal and Infinite Spirit: the Creator and the Sovereign of the Universe." Can we really ask, "Is that Creator a force or a person?" I think not from that definition. For He is evidenced therein as both—a force and a person. He IS! And therefore He is ALL. "In Him we live and move and have our being." God is force, power, energy; also, these qualities in Him spring from the particular, peculiar and infinite nature of His Divine Personality. "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made."

But such things to some men require proof, not mere as-

sertion. They were not said or admitted by the late German Professor of Biology, Ernst Haeckel; neither are they said today by his followers. Perhaps Professor Haeckel was the greatest and most destructive critic of the Bible and of Christianity in recent times. As a biologist he had a world-wide reputation as a first class exponent of his subject. His writings were most widely read by natural scientists, and by thoughtful working men all over the civilized world—up to 1914. Those sixpenny editions of his works on "Monism," and on "The Riddle of the Universe" were revelled in by many thousands of studious people whose minds were restive under the teachings of orthodox exponents of Christianity; and the arguments, conclusions, and inferences therein given provided many hard nuts for the orthodox Christian preachers to crack and chew.

As I understand Professor Haeckel he had two scientific doctrines upon which he founded that natural philosophy by means of which he hoped to demonstrate to mankind that this universe could well be accounted for without admitting the need for any divine personal creator or overseer. His doctrines were, briefly, the sufficiency of chemistry and material evolution to account for all that nature presents to our view. And he claimed to have discovered a special true law, which he termed "The Law of Substance." To this physical doctrine of the Law of Substance, based upon two other admitted laws, viz., the conservation of matter, and the conservation of energy, he attached extraordinary importance. He wrote of this Law of Substance:

> This fundamental cosmic law establishes the eternal persistence of matter and force: their unvarying constancy throughout the entire universe: . . . it is the pole-star that guides our monistic philosophy through the mighty labyrinth of the world problem.

That problem which he tried to solve is "The How, the Why, the Whence, and Whither?" of Creation. And so enamoured was he of his discovery of the Law of Substance that he referred to it variously and affectionately as "The Fundamental Cosmic Law, "The Universal Law," "The

Law of Constancy," The Axiom of the Constancy of the Universe," "The Ultimate Reality." Thus he, a thinking, learned man, of world-wide reputation and world-wide knowledge is quite content, personally, to regard matter as "The Ultimate Reality"; and to direct all his followers to that end. Everything really is of the earth, earthy! He says:

> The idea of God is identical with that of nature or substance.
> Pantheism teaches that God and the world are one.
> God is everywhere identical with nature itself, and is operative within the world as "force or energy."
> Pantheism is the world-system of the modern scientist.
> This godless world-system substantially agrees with the Monism or Pantheism of the modern scientist.

"Then," says a critic of Haeckel, "pantheism is only a polite form of atheism." Perhaps some critics of him would say that it is not even polite!

And all these conclusions were drawn by Haeckel from two recent general deductions of natural science regarding the powers lying inherent in chemistry and biology. They suffice to replace the Deity Himself in the universe, in Haeckel's teaching. He had no room in all his thinking and writing about "Monism" (i.e., one substance) except for matter as that one substance. His physical hand or body was thus more real than his soul or his faith. He had no consideration for the reality of mind, spirit, will, understanding; for guidance, directing agency, and control as being indefinitely greater and realler than the things directed and controlled by those spiritual forces. Yet, every day, in every way, he could see puny men exercising perfect manipulative power over bulky material things, because of their minds, which are spiritual and not material forces. Man's mind is immeasurably greater, according to all true standards of measurement, than the matter which it hurls to and fro. How much greater, then, is the mind of that Divine Architect, Builder and Controller of this marvelous universe —this universe of which the most learned of men are ready to admit that they are only "pebble-gatherers" upon the

shore of an infinite ocean of truth that lies beyond the little stretch of sand which they see! The best of them are the meekest, and they are all ready to say "Plus ultra!" More beyond; for matter, sense, and time must not be allowed to shut us in, much more "this muddy vesture of decay."

Nowadays most of you know Sir Oliver Lodge through his books, or through his most admirable addresses over the wireless. Probably there is no more learned, sane, and wise natural scientist, and spiritual guide united, dispensing welcome light on the fundamental problems of life on this earth at the present day. Sir Oliver willingly, gladly, acknowledges the great attainments of Professor Haeckel in the realms of biological science and of chemistry; but there is a very great deal of which he disapproves in Haeckel's deductions from his natural knowledge. Sir Oliver says:

> Matter (natural substance) possesses energy in the form of persistent motion (weight) and it is propelled by force . . . but neither matter nor energy possesses the power of automatic guidance and control. . . . Inorganic matter (e.g., ironstone) is impelled solely from behind: it is not influenced by the future, nor by an end that is planned and thought out.

But all through this universe there run what are technically called "teleological objects": that means, objects which manifest plan and design—intelligent aims, wise measures, good provisions for human needs. These good, wise, intelligent things can only have come from One Source, an Intelligent Source; a Source Which, or Who, is not only human, but superhuman; a Source which is even wiser, better, and abler in human kindness than any other source or power we can know or even conceive. And we believe that this Source of all creation, this Great First Cause of all good things, has been graciously pleased to meet our need for knowledge of Himself, by revealing Himself in His Holy Word as personal, individual, and unique, as the Divine Man, the Lord God and Savior Jesus Christ.

Sir Oliver Lodge says:

> Let the materialist (scientist) beware, and bethink himself twice

or even thrice, before he conceives that he understands the universe and is competent to pour scorn upon the intuitions and perceptions of great men in what may be to him alien regions of thought and experience. . . . Let him (Professor Haeckel) explain, if he can, what he means by his own identity . . . by the material particles that form his natural body.

Sir Oliver Lodge says to those who would turn God out of this universe—the materialists:

It behooves the man of science to put his hand upon his mouth, lest in his efforts to be true in the absence of knowledge, he find himself uttering in his ignorance words of lamentable folly or blasphemy.

And even the late Professor Thomas H. Huxley, the agnostic, said:

If I were obliged to choose between absolute materialism and absolute idealism (i.e., the spiritual interpretation of life) I should feel compelled to accept the latter alternative.

And when, during the past year, the battle between the materialists and the idealists was once again joined, we have Sir Oliver Lodge at a great meeting of working men, held in Salem Congregational Church, Leeds (September, 1927) bearing testimony on behalf of the idealistic, the spiritual, and the eternal views in these remarkable words:

I warn you against the narrow vision of the man of science. . . . I have had my blinkers taken off, and the result is I don't go so fast as to miss things by the roadside of life; I see the Spiritual World; I see a lot of psychical (spiritual) things the scientific man won't admit. . . . We must press ever forward towards the mark of our high calling in Christ Jesus. . . . We (I, and other science teachers) used to think that matter was everything. We do not think that now. The dust shall return to the earth, but the spirit shall return to God who gave it.

The late Professor Haeckel said that the trinity which he believed in was the True, the Good, and the Beautiful. These qualities of soul were said to exist all apart from any person who was divinely true and good and beautiful. And the German philosopher, Professor Immanuel Kant,

and the German poet, Herr Johann W. von Goethe, both expressed their belief in three fundamentals of human thought, viz., God, Freedom and Immortality. Now I venture to aver that both sets of trines are absolutely necessary for logical and reasonable thinking upon the origins and designs of this universe, and that the two trines are revealed through God's word in the glorified man, Jesus Christ, God manifest, the Creator, Redeemer, Regenerator, and Savior. For He is substance and form itself. He is divine substance, and from Him are spiritual substance and physical substance. He is Divine love, Divine wisdom, and Divine power; and these qualities of His nature necessarily include "the true, the good, and the beautiful"; also, "God, freedom, and immortality"; also, "force, reason, and life."

The Word of the Lord and the Writings of the New Church have very much to tell us in confirmation of the above-named revealed things.

> God is love. . . . Love and wisdom in God are one, and infinitely one. They are indivisible in Him. God is one in essence and person, and Jesus Christ is that one God.

The Apostle John was inspired to write of Jesus thus: "He was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." If that has any meaning, it surely has this: that Jesus was God manifested through the word, wisdom, or truth which flowed from Him, and which was Himself, and is very reality. "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." Thus we are led to believe that creation, like redemption, is a work purely Divine. The world was made by the Almighty, is sustained by Him, and preserved by Him. For "preservation or subsistence is perpetual creation." These things are seen by us New-Church men and women in scriptural and rational light. They were not so seen in John's time, although he was inspired to write and declare them.

It was taught for long enough in the past that a malignant spirit made this world. It is not so taught now.

For the beauty of the earth,
For the beauty of the skies,
For the love which, from our birth,
Over and around us lies,
Father! unto Thee we raise
This, our sacrifice of praise.

That gracious Being made the world Who came afterwards in the flesh to redeem and save it. This natural universe was made by the Lord God through the spiritual universe of which He is the sun and the centre, and the Source.

A twofold world
Must go to a perfect cosmos. Natural things
And spiritual,—who separates those two
In art, in morals, or the social drift,
Tears up the bond of nature and brings death,
Paints futile pictures, writes unreal verse,
Leads vulgar days, deals ignorantly with men,
Is wrong, in short, at all points.
—*Mrs. Browning's Aurora Leigh, VII, 760.*

In Annandale's dictionary the word "force" (from Latin *fortis,* strong) is thus defined:

Active power; might; vigour; strength; energy; that which is the source of all the active phenomena occurring in the world; that which produces, or tends to produce change; one of the modes or forms in which energy is exhibited in nature, as heat, electricity, momentum; the quantity of energy or power exerted by a moving active body.

The Writings tell us:

The Omnipresent God created the world from the order which is in Himself, consequently agreeable to the order in which He Himself is, and according to which He rules; and He stamped on the universe and all its parts, as on man and beast, on birds and fishes, on worms, on every tree and herb, its own particular order. (True Christian Religion, n. 73.)

Hence it is plain to the angels that the created universe is an image representative of God-man, and that it is His love and wisdom which in the universe are presented in an image. . . . Not that the created universe is God-man, but that it is from Him; for nothing whatever in the created universe is substance and form in itself, or

life in itself, or love and wisdom in itself; nay, neither is a man a man in himself; but all is from God, Who is man, wisdom and love, and form and substance in Himself. That which is in itself is uncreate and infinite; but that which is from Him, inasmuch as it carries nothing with it which is self-existent, is created and finite; and this represents an image of Him from Whom it is and exists. (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 52.)

Unless a just idea of spiritual things, and of creation by means of them, be first obtained, the human mind may, by mere ignorance, be easily betrayed into an idea of the creation of the universe by nature; and allow nature to be created by God; only in compliance with the authority of the Church; but because it knows not how this was effected, if it enters upon a deeper investigation of the subject, it falls into naturalism, which denies the Being of God. (True Christian Religion, n. 75.)

Thus we learn that

There is but one Lord God Almighty: He is the Creator and Preserver of the universe: He is the Redeemer and Savior of men: the name of this one Lord God Almighty is Jesus Christ. He is one in essence and person. He is the One Source and Fount of Life. He is the centre of the sun of heaven which is the first beginning of finiteness, and is the instrumental cause of creation.

And such is the fulness of the Lord's love for the human race, that He imparts to every human being whom He creates a capacity for the enjoyment of every happiness. And such is the fulness of His wisdom and power, that He provides for the salvation of all who desire to be saved.

Is this God a person or a force? Well, it is utterly impossible to speak or write of intelligent operations in this universe without being involved from first to last in personality, and through that personality comes all the force that is manifested in the universe.

The word "person" (Latin *per,* through, and *sono,* sound) is from *persona,* which primarily meant a mask used by actors upon the stage of a theatre. From thence it came to mean a part played, a character assumed, a face through which speech and sound came to the audiences in the theatres. From that the word came to mean an individual human being—man, woman, or child. It is this aspect of the personal, divinely human character of the Creator of the uni-

verse that I desire to dwell upon for a little while. Some time before he passed within the veil, the late Lord Kelvin gave utterance to some arresting statements regarding "Science and creative power." He said that he could not accept the saying of some materialists to the effect that with regard to the origin of life "science neither affirmed nor denied creative power."

> Science positively affirmed creative power. Science made everyone feel a miracle in himself, and compelled them to accept a creative and directive power, not as an article of traditional faith, but as an article of belief from which there was no escape. . . .
>
> Modern biologists were coming once more to the acceptance of something unknown which they might call "vital force." In thinking of that unknown object, they were in science all agnostics; they did not know. They only knew God in His works. But they were absolutely forced by science to admit and believe in a directive power, in something more than physical, dynamical, or electric forces. There was nothing between absolute scientific belief in creative power and the acceptance of the theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. But it was absurd to think of a sprig of moss, a microbe, or a living animal arising through a number of atoms falling together of their own accord. A million of millions of millions of years could not, in that way, give them a beautiful world like ours. In science they had a knowledge that there was a spiritual influence in the world about them. Let them be free in their thought. They were then bound to come to the conviction that science was not antagonistic but a help to religion.

Lord Kelvin further wrote to *The Times* newspaper, and said:

> I was in the country, walking with Liebig (the great German chemist) some 40-odd years ago, when I asked him, "Do you believe that the grass and flowers grow by mere chemical forces?" The reply of Liebig was short and to the point: "No! No more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical forces."

But still many persons would like to pursue the subject further. It has been well remarked by one writer that the origin and nature of life upon this earth has very justly been regarded as the great mystery of creation. It is a question

upon which the popular philosophy has tried its utmost strength. Vainly different theorists have well nigh paralysed their mental powers in fruitless attempts to solve the mighty problem, what is life's origin? while scientific men have been looking with searching scrutiny into the structure of all known living organisms, to detect, if possible, that latent principle which constitutes the first movement of all their functions. But the question has proved too profound for a merely sensuous philosophy, and too difficult for the unaided ingenuity of man. Light was needed from the inner and upper world, whence all genuine life and light descend. And that light has at length been received. Life is love, spirit, God. God is love. "I AM LIFE." All life in its inward real sense is love; and, therefore, it is from the one ocean—God.

> Sun of my soul, Thou Savior dear,
> It is not night if Thou be near;
> Come near and bless us when we wake
> Ere through the world our way we take;
> Till, in the Ocean of Thy Love,
> We lose ourselves in heaven above.

Therefore there is, in the Lord God, the Savior Jesus Christ, infinite personality, life, and force.

Man has two faculties for the reception of life from God. These faculties are his will and his understanding. Into these two faculties the Divine life which is love and wisdom flows. Life received by man in the will is the origin of love and affection in him. Life received in the understanding is the origin of thought, and of perception of truth. The will is the first receptacle of life in man. In it every desire and affection originates. But the life of the will descends also into the understanding. The affections are formed into thoughts, and hence love is the life of the spirit of man, the moving principle of his every emotion and perception.

But for the Lord's personal restraints and defences all good creatures—animal and human—would be shouldered off the face of this earth. For evil creatures are rampant,

powerful, and destructive. Yet, in the Divine Providence and Operation evil creatures tend to slay themselves. All the physical life of our natural body—the life that's in the flesh, the blood, and the bones—has a spiritual origin. It is derived from the interior life of God—the Great Spirit—through the spirit of man.

Thus, all life being love, what each man and woman ardently and interiorly longs for, and strives for, affects for good or ill, every particle of his bodies—his spiritual and his natural body. "There IS a natural body, and there IS a spiritual body" (I Cor. xv, 44). Every hair on man's head is affected by love or lust. Every part of his spiritual and natural bodies, even his finger nails, is affected for health, joy, and peace—other things being equal—if a man loves heavenly things, and keeps his Lord's Commandments. And so are all parts of him affected for disease, pain, and death, if he is lusting after unholy and forbidden things. And the Decalogue teaches what evils are sins, and are forbidden.

In conclusion, shall we not express the prayers of our life—our spiritual aspirations, our speech and our deeds—in the words of one verse of that hymn written by the late Dean Plumptre with such telling effect—

O Light, O Way, O Truth, O Life!
O Jesus, born mankind to save!
Give Thou Thy help in fiercest strife,
Shed Thou Thy calm on stormiest wave:
Be Thou our Father, Friend and King,
And let our lives Thy praises sing.

ARTHUR STONES.

Ramsbottom,
Lancashire, England.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION*

By the Rev. Lewis F. Hite

HUMAN LIFE has been dominated since the dawn of history by two constant forces: the guidance of knowledge of the outer world; and the recognition of a higher power which directs and controls the events of the world, and especially the course of man's life. Knowledge of the outer world has been gradually systematized. Meanwhile, certain aspects, or fields, of knowledge have been distinguished and set apart for concentrated attention and separate development. The growth of these more or less independent branches of knowledge resulted in what we now call "the special sciences." We can see this process strikingly exhibited in the history of Greek philosophy, and especially in the work of Aristotle. In Plato, the whole body of knowledge was treated with dramatic completeness and in its concrete unity. But Aristotle began the work of specialization, and blocked out with final distinctness rhetoric, psychology, ethics, politics, natural history, physics, and above all metaphysics. This scheme of the sciences was adopted and perpetuated by the schools of the Middle Ages in the form of the Trivium and Quadrivium, which comprised grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic for the humanistic group, and arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy for the group of the physical sciences. These were afterwards

**Religious Experience and Scientific Method.* By Henry Nelson Wieman, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Occidental College. New York: Macmillan Co. 1926. 387 pp., 8vo. Cloth, price $2.25.

The Wrestle of Religion with Truth. By Henry Nelson Wieman, Divinity School, University of Chicago. New York: Macmillan Co. 1927. 256 pp., 8vo. Cloth, price $2.50.

known and cultivated as the "Seven Liberal Arts," and formed the basis of the Bachelor of Arts degree. The work of Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton gave an immense stimulus to fresh development of the physical sciences, especially mathematics and physics. Dalton's revival of the atomic theory placed chemistry on a systematic experimental and theoretical basis, and led to the wonderful achievements of present-day chemistry. In the meantime, Linnæus, Cuvier, and Agassiz laid the foundations of systematic biology. As a result of the concentrated attention and laborious pursuit, an enormous body of material has been acquired in the field of nature, and highly refined methods of procedure have been established, until now the weight and authority of science are almost overwhelming.

On the other hand, religion operates most effectively through social institutions and social control. Knowledge of nature is, of course, appropriated; but ordinarily Divine aid is not sought in the effort to learn the facts of the world, and to understand them. Religion is rather a practical matter, and has to do with successful living. Prayer is offered in the case of difficult and hazardous undertakings, or on important social occasions. Ideas about God and about proper relations to Him become fixed in the social group, and are passed on by tradition; in this way, they acquire influence and binding authority. But the ground of religion is man's capacity to receive Divine impulse and revelation. So that social recognition and authority combine with acknowledgment and adoration of the Divine to make religion a constant and superior force in control of conduct, motive, and thought.

Science and religion, therefore, are the two great factors of human life. We live in the atmosphere of these two influences, and draw from each our daily mental and spiritual sustenance. The relation between the two, their co-operation and their opposition, are matters of vital importance.

With some imperatively needed qualifications, the books

before us—"Religious Experience and Scientific Method" and "The Wrestle of Religion with Truth"—give an admirable and useful account of the nature and relations of science and religion. The books are really thoughtful and well written. The author, Dr. Henry Nelson Wieman, is well informed and independent, inspired by an earnest and clearly defined purpose. The present-day conceptions of science and religion are discussed with assuring competence, and with fresh insight.

The earlier book deals with religious experience and scientific method in a way to show their mutual dependence. Part I essays to tell why religion needs science. Under this head there are four chapters: I. Science and Our Knowledge of God; II. Science the Corrective of Religion; III. Thought and Worship; IV. Christianity and Love. Part II undertakes to tell why science needs religion. Here there are five chapters: I. The Two Sides of Life; II. Scientific Method; III. Awareness and Scientific Discovery; IV. Rebirth and Auto-suggestion; V. Christianity and Scientific Morality. Part III discusses the nature and function of religion, in four chapters: I. Religion and Ideals; II. Christianity and Psychology; III. Religion and Reflective Thinking; IV. The Emergence of Religion.

A glance at this table shows at once that the author plunges into deep subjects. The reason why religion needs science and science needs religion is, that religious experience and scientific experience have a common environment. The key to the author's position, and the fundamental assumption of his philosophy, is that human experience is fully characterized as re-action to the environment. The difference between scientific and religious experience is that the latter is re-action to a special feature of the environment; viz., that feature upon which man is dependent for the most complete enjoyment of life. Religion is adjustment to this most important feature of the environment. Science is corrective of religion by virtue of its experimental method. Science is re-action and adjustment to selected

features of the environment, those features which can be brought most directly to the test of experiment. For the author, the typical religious experience is mysticism, that experience in which definite objects and definite ideas fade from consciousness; nevertheless the experience is all the more intensified at this stage. He adopts from the mystic the word "contemplation" to designate the peculiar character of religious experience, but he excludes the state of passiveness which contemplation usually implies. Contemplation means complete absorption in the larger and all-comprehensive experience. Science and scientific method should correct the tendency to illusion which is so common in mystic experience; also to sentimentality. Science needs religion because it is selective and narrowing and abstract, whereas religion is inclusive and concrete. It is interesting and significant that the author groups together love, art, and religion in contrast with science, on the ground that they agree in being inclusive and concrete. Perhaps, from the New-Church point of view, what the author has to say about love is the central and most significant feature of the book; it is promising, yet disappointing. He has been describing "the contemplative way of life" as combining æsthetic appreciation with intellectual efficiency; but he recognizes that contemplation as ordinarily understood does not express this adequately, and is inclined to use the word love for this purpose. On this point, a paragraph is worth quoting:

> Now this way of life, which is both active and appreciative, intellectually accurate but at the same time receptive to the concrete fulness of sense, this way of life appears most completely in love. Indeed there is no other form known to man in which this contemplative life can be developed to such a high degree. Love yields the most full-orbed life precisely because it brings about this unification of opposites and provides that delicate and difficult balance which we have been tracing throughout the foregoing chapters; in love at its best we find on the one hand that striving for knowledge freed from illusion which culminates in scientific method, and on the other hand that striving for fullest immediate awareness of fact which culminates in mysticism. In love, then, we find reconciliation

and unification of that which distinguishes science on the one hand and religion on the other.

This is the author's way of saying that love unifies science and religion. In other words, love is wise; love is that experience which is at once immediate concrete awareness and perception of relations. "We love the total individuality," not merely the present aspect, but the past and future aspects as well, and in spite of weaknesses, faults, and wrong-doing. This completeness and concreteness of genuine love is contrasted with the illusions of sentimental love. Sentimental love creates out of its object, or as its object, an ideal picture, and thus shuts out of view the real object. This distinction reminds us of Swedenborg's analysis of love, and of his distinction between real love and selfish love. Genuine love feels another's joy as its own; but to feel one's own joy in another is not real love, but selfish love. In other words, if we project our fancies into the object, and so create a fictitious object, then we merely love ourselves in the object, which is self-love. Important as is the author's analysis of love and the distinction between genuine and sentimental love, nevertheless he fails to do full justice to sentimental love. The history of romantic love shows that sentimental love has played an admirable and essential part in the advancement of man's social, domestic, and religious life. The truth is that sentimental love is a uniform constituent of all human love, for the reason that man is finite, and his knowledge under normal and proper conditions is ever enlarging; so that while love does indeed take in the object as a concrete whole, it acquires the details only with further acquaintance. In the meantime, associations, ideas, and sentiments come into play, and become incorporated in the experience of the object, and are projected into the object as constituents of its nature. Accordingly, members of the family circle, friends, and other persons are always more or less idealized, and the ideas we have of their various traits and qualities arouse sentiments in us which form a significant part of our experience of the whole per-

son. In this way, sentimental love is the love of these idealized traits and qualities attributed to the personality of the one who is loved, and is an inevitable and important character of all human love, and of personal love in particular. It heightens the joy of social intercourse; it glorifies and sustains interest in the object loved in the course of further acquaintance. Disappointment and disillusion may come; but we should be slow to abandon the treasures of sentimental love, and so miss the strength and fulness they give to love as a whole. We should, however, beware of the subtle influence of sentimental love in creating a fictitious object, and making that the sole object of our total love, as this leads to complete illusion, and to a disastrous substitution of the creations of our own fancy for the real object, and to a glorification of self-love.

With some exaggeration, the author dwells on the nature of love to persist, when the object, the person, is found to have weaknesses and perversities. This is the fact expressed by the saying "With all thy faults I love thee still." It is the quality of mercy. We are taught that the Lord created man pure and free; and loved him because he was good. When man sinned, the Lord still loved him; but now the love acquired the quality of mercy. And it is the Lord's love as mercy that works the salvation of man. In other words, it is love as mercy that is the transforming power that overcomes the evil in man. This is exemplified supremely in the Lord's saving power, but also in the love of parent for child, and friend for friend. The faults, errors, and wrongdoing are seen and felt with pain at heart; but the love persists with the desire to obliterate these things, and free the personality from them.

The paragraph on love is by the way, but it leads to the further contrast between science and religion. This contrast is formulated in terms of adaptation and efficiency on the one hand, appreciation and creativity on the other. It is the aim of science to describe, define, predict, and control the operations of nature; and the ideal is to reduce the world to

mechanistic and materialistic terms. The aim of religion in this view is the free expression of spirit, and the free development of purpose. The one tendency leads to detailed analysis, to measurable quantities, and to efficient action; the other leads to the concrete apprehension and appreciation of the whole. These two tendencies are apt to lead in opposite directions; this is the case when one is followed without reference to the other. But this opposition is unnecessary and mischievous. The bond of union between the two is the fact that both are contained within the total body of experience; they are bifurcations, and lead back to the all-inclusive body of experience from which they issued. Experience affords two modes of treatment. We may attempt to describe it, and go on to test our descriptions by experiment, experimental verification ending in building up the body of the sciences; or we may attempt to appreciate it and estimate its value, that is, we may delight in its wealth. So we have experimental verification, which is scientific method, and we have satisfaction of feeling, which finds expression in art, love, and religion.

We pass over much good discussion of important topics, such as morality, types of religious experience, and especially the difference between mystic experience and Christianity. Special stress is laid upon the contrast between morality and science on the one hand and religious experience on the other. It is consistently and elaborately maintained that morality, like science, is selective and narrowing, by establishing definite habits and by excluding irrelevant impulses and re-actions. Religious experience, on the other hand, is inclusive, and is the total body of re-action to the whole environment, or to the best part of it. Many aspects of religion and science come under consideration, but this contrast is a constant and dominating feature of the entire discussion from beginning to end. It is the aim and function of science to describe, to analyze, to control and direct the course of events; the method of science is observation and experimentation. This means selection of subject

matter and objects of interest; it means direction and concentration of attention, exclusion of irrelevant matters, and restriction to the matter in hand. By such specification, selection, and concentration, the several branches of science were set apart and built up. But these interests and processes give to science its peculiar character of abstractedness. Each special science is a selected and abstracted feature of the total experience. Chemistry, for example, restricts itself to the laws of the composition of bodies; physics concentrates upon the laws of the movements of bodies; mathematics deals with the characters of number and quantity; and so on. Within each science, the processes of specification, selection, and abstraction are carried from larger to ever finer and more minute details, until we have the present immensely complicated systems of abstractions, such as mathematics and physics. In fact, the whole body of science is an elaborate system of abstractions, which have been taken out of concrete experience by infinitely patient labor, and which refer back to experience in a wonderful way to promote both thinking and living. The growth of science illustrates the process of passing from the concrete universal to less and less general characters until we arrive at particular. This seems to be the movement of thought and of life; in fact, the process of creation.

In contrast with this process of specification, selection, and abstraction—the process of analysis and exclusion—religion is the form of experience like art, which apprehends, appreciates, and finds satisfaction in the concrete whole. It is inclusive and comprehensive; it is re-action to the undifferentiated and unanalyzed environment. It is the type of experience exemplified by mysticism, wherein we are conscious of no defined object, but feel the presence of the unbounded whole. The unqualified richness of this experience, often raised to the sublime height of overflowing ecstasy, is man's full and immediate response to the Divine Presence. This view of religion is that propagated by William James in his "Varieties of Religious Experience,"

wherein he selected extreme cases, and made them typical. No doubt there are in this class many examples of genuine religion; but there is also a great deal of delusion. It may be that in all religion there is some approach at times to the kind of experience which mysticism exemplifies in the extreme; but ordinarily we do not have any vivid awareness of the Divine Presence as in states of exaltation. Rather, we usually go about our business with a background of religious sentiment, thought, and principles as the atmosphere in which we live, and through which we have access to the Lord, and the Lord has specific access to us. In other words, religion becomes a good habit which keeps us in the way of upward life.

Altogether, the author's view of religion is at once too individualistic and too universalistic. He does indeed recognize the social character of religion, and he also recognizes the difference between religion and psychology, especially in making the distinction between re-birth and auto-suggestion. Re-birth is a transformation and fusion of conflicting attitudes, tendencies, and habits; it is quite different from substituting one set of habits for another. It gives a unified, harmonious, and happy personality, with fulness of life and exaltation of state. But the experience is the individual's re-action to the environment; and the environment is an unqualified and unanalyzed whole, a universal presence. The individual is the center and source of the experience; the environment conditions and provokes the experience, but is not properly constitutive of it. The individual is creator, not creature.

The need of science, as systematized knowledge of man and nature, for the proper development of moral and religious life is obvious. But when we reflect that science is selective, analytic, and exclusive, we observe that these functions do not meet the needs of man's growing life, "cannot create in us new interests," new ideals. The scientific method of observation and experiment deals with present fact and established laws. It can predict the future within

its system; but it cannot rise to new levels, it cannot furnish the proper stimulus to new impulses and new efforts. A scientific morality would make our present possessions effective, and our efforts consistent; but what the moral life needs for renewal and advancement is not merely the satisfaction of existing wants, but stimulus to new wants. This need is met by religious experience, and above all by Christian experience. The moral life is more than the pursuit and fulfilment of ideals recognized and already in possession; its full satisfaction is found only in a constant supply of "radically new ideals." Religious experience in worship and prayer brings us nearer to the source of new life, and into states of mind favorable to the reception of new influences. Modern psychology has directed attention to the "subconscious" as a source of this "influx of power"; and the question is raised whether this influx comes from a source external to the individual, or whether it has its source within the individual. This is the question which divides the naturalistic from the religious view, and points to the fundamental issue between psychology and religion. If the source of this influx is the subconscious depths of the individual, then the whole process lies within the nature of man, and we have a naturalistic philosophy of life; but if the influx is from without, then the way is open for all the functions of religion, and for a religious interpretation of the experience.

This brings us to the author's fundamental idea as to the nature of experience in general, and religious experience in particular. We are familiar with the psychological doctrine of the "reflex arc." The child sees the moon, and puts out its little hand to grasp it. This means that the light-rays reflected from the moon impinge upon the retina of the eye, and set up a nerve current to the brain center, where the structure of the cell is such that the incoming current is received and sent back along another route to the muscles of the arm and hand, and the movement follows. In this way, according to some, all our bodily movements are ex-

plained; and the explanation is extended to all forms of our behavior, although of course the re-action system becomes immensely complicated when the expression of sentiments, ideas, and purposes is involved. This scheme develops into the general distinction between man and his environment. Accordingly man's life is completely summed up as re-action to his environment; and this is the formula which the author adopts for his exposition. But for him, man and the environment are so intimately associated that they combine in every function. For example, the air takes as much part in breathing as the lungs.

> Breathing is a total complex process of interaction between organism and environment, in which the environment is just as active as the organism. . . . What is true of breathing is likewise true of anything else one may do.

It is true of our mental as well as of our bodily activities, that the interaction between organism and environment is mutual and reciprocal; each takes a proper and necessary part. If then we ask whence comes the energy, the influx of power, the answer is both from within and from without. All this, however, is considerably overdrawn; the case is by no means so clear-cut. It is true that the air entering the lungs exerts force, there is influx of power from without; but the muscles of the chest combine to lower the diaphragm and lift the ribs, and so enlarge the capacity of the chest to receive the incoming air. The initial force comes from the brain cells which send currents to the muscles; this is influx of power from within. So it is not quite exact to say that the organism and the environment are on equal terms. Take a more complicated case. We speak of the blue sky as part of the environment, and of our re-action to it in the act of seeing; but a little reflection brings us face to face with one of the most puzzling and persistent of philosophical problems. Calling to our aid the science of optics, we may say very briefly that the rays of light reflected from the sky, or more strictly, from the atmosphere, impinge upon the retina, and there set up a nerve current to the brain centers. Then we have the sensation of blue; that is, we see the blue sky.

But where is the color blue? Obviously, it is not in the light-rays; these are not seen to be blue, in fact they are not seen at all. It is not in the nerve current, nor in the brain centers, for these are not seen, and even if they were, they would not be blue. Neither is the blue in the sky; for, as the science of physics tells us, there is no sky to be blue, there is only the atmosphere whose colorless particles reflect the rays of light. It follows that the blue is not in the physical world at all. Where then is the blue? Here we come to one of those ambiguous facts that have baffled human intelligence from its first attempts to solve the riddle of sense-perception. Common sense assures us that the blue is in the sky; physical science teaches that there is no such thing as the sky, and so there is no blue sky; psychology tells us that blue is a sensation, and that if anywhere it is in the mind. Philosophy affirms that the blue sky is an appearance. These three statements are equally valid from the several points of view, but they are not altogether consistent. The divergence appears fundamentally in the issue between the philosophies of realism and idealism. Realism undertakes to maintain that the sky is blue—as it is seen to be. Idealism argues that the blue is a state of mind, and has no existence outside, or apart from, the mind. In defending this view, idealism introduces the two convenient, but deeply mysterious, terms, "projection" and "appearance." From this point on both philosophies become involved in an elaborate metaphysics, which has not yet been cleared up to the satisfaction of all parties. In view of such metaphysics, it is safe to say that the status of the blue sky in the field of experience is not fully determined, and that we are not justified in placing it unreservedly in the environment. It is quite true that we do re-act to the blue sky in various ways. We admire its beauty, for example, feel disappointed at its over-cast, and so on. But this does not put it in the external, physical environment; nor does this mere fact of re-action make the difference between the experience of the subject and that which is other than the

experience of the subject. We do as a matter of fact and of habit think of the color of the orange as belonging to it quite apart from our experience of the orange; and so in the case of the blue sky. But the foregoing analysis shows that the blue of the sky is part of our experience, and not something other than our experience. The same is true of all our sense experience, whether of sight, hearing, taste, smell, or the rest. In other words, the environment is in large part our own experience and the product of our experience. When therefore we attempt to make the distinction between our experience as re-action and adjustment on the one hand and the environment to which we re-act on the other, we are presupposing a difference which strictly speaking does not exist in reality, but only for special purposes; consequently, we should be careful not to make too much of this distinction.

The lesson of all this is that the distinction between organism and environment is questionable, and begins to fade out when submitted to close examination. This means that we have to take the author's formula, "re-action or adjustment, to environment," quite critically, especially as this formula is used to express the nature of religious experience.

So far we have devoted prolonged attention to the first volume, "Religious Experience and Scientific Method." We feel justified in this for the reason that in the first volume we find an unusually thoughtful, interesting, and profitable discussion of the fundamental principles of the author's religious philosophy. In the second volume, "The Wrestle of Religion with Truth," he goes over the ground afresh with more specific reference to the present acute stage of religious controversy.

The scope and general character of the latter book is indicated by the table of contents. There are two parts. The first on the "Method of Religion" has seven chapters: I. Present State of Religious Thought; II. The Method of Religious Inquiry; III. Worship as a Means to Successful Living; IV. Habits and the Perception of God; V. How We

Are Re-made; VI. How Religion Cures Human Ill; VII. The Religious Vision.

Part Two on the "Concepts of Religion" has eight chapters: I. The Nature of Religion; II. Ultimate Cause, Supreme Good and Religious Experience; III. (The same continued); IV. The Concept of God; V. Scientific Test of This Concept; VI. Religious Test of This Concept; VII. Religion and Truth; VIII. Religion and Philosophy.

These several topics are discussed with reference to ideas of religion and of God which we must examine with critical attention. These ideas grow out of a metaphysical theory as to the nature of experience in general and of man's experience in particular. The theory is based upon a distinction between man and his environment; and man's life is wholly comprehended in re-action to the environment. Religious life is distinguished from common sense and science by the fact that these latter are particular forms of reaction to specific characters of the environment, whereas religion is the re-action of man's life as a whole to the environment as a whole. The author is quite right in viewing religion as man's life in relation to God, which is another way of saying that the idea of God is the necessary and characteristic component of religion. This seems quite a different position from that of the humanist or humanitarian, the religion of humanity,—the idea that religion is a practical life of usefulness in the community, whether with or without the idea of God. But from the nature of the author's metaphysics, the outcome of his view is about the same; in other words, the difference tends to disappear as we look deeper into the real meaning of his position.

> Religion is man's endeavor to adapt himself to the facts of existence. It differs from other such endeavors in that it seeks adaptation of the whole life to ultimate facts.

It is this qualification of "ultimate facts" that leads to the idea of God. Among the facts of existence, God is the Ultimate Fact. This definition of God leads to consequences of critical importance. It makes God a part of the environ-

ment, and reduces religion to re-action to this environment, which is defined in more and more naturalistic terms. The impression of the naturalistic character of the author's idea of God is strengthened rather than removed by further and closer examination. We begin with his most studied and most deliberate attempt to state "the formal concept of God." It occurs in the Introduction, page 14, and condenses what he has to say about God here and there throughout the book. It is convenient to give the statement as it stands:

> Very briefly, God is that feature of our total environment which most vitally affects the continuance and welfare of human life. More specifically, God is that character of events to which man must adjust himself in order to attain the greatest goods and avoid the greatest evils.

It may, of course, be said that in some sense God is a feature of the environment; but the statement is too ambiguous to be profitable. To say that God is a part of the universe, while true enough, may be as misleading as to say that He is the universe. All such statements lack the definite meaning needed to give positive information. The idea of adjustment is of ever-present importance; the outward conduct of life being in large part adjustment to the facts or events of the world. The facts are too numerous and too diverse for us to make adjustments to them all. We must choose; some are objects of interest and importance, some we ignore. The source of this choice is other than the environment; it lies within, in the hidden affections of the man. These affections become ends, and the business of adjustment is concerned with the facts we recognize as obstacles, or as ways and means to the attainment of the end. No doubt, stimulus and response play a large part in life; but life is more than response, re-action, to the external environment. Impulses, desires, and purposes come from within, and in further analysis we may identify them as affections of love. But there is Divine Love as well as human love, and in the last analysis human love implies the Divine Love. In other words, human love does not exist apart from the

Divine Love. When we speak of environment, therefore, we must distinguish between the external environment, the physical world, and the internal environment, the Source of life within. When God is spoken of as "that feature of our total environment which," etc., we must make this distinction; but even when the distinction is made we must go further and add that God is more than environment, that He is the inner Source, the Preserver, and the Sustainer of man's life.

The author intends to be more specific, when, borrowing from the metaphysics of A. N. Whitehead, he says that "God is that character of events to which man must adjust himself to attain the greatest goods and avoid the greatest evils." It may be said quite properly that adjustment to God is the way to obtain the greatest goods and avoid the greatest evils; but to think of God as a character of events is to put Him in the realm of cosmological obscurity, and to remove Him immensely from the position of personal Helper.

According to the metaphysics of Whitehead, the universe is an event, one total event which comprises innumerable subordinate events. Some events are more comprehensive and important than others. By "important" is meant, that re-action to some events is followed by more beneficial consequences than to others. The revolution of the earth around the sun is an event of great importance, and proper adjustment to it brings continued joy of life. The seasons, day and night, heat and cold, etc., depend upon this event. An earthquake is an event of destructive importance. The fall of an apple is in itself an event of small importance, although Newton is said to have deduced from it the law of gravitation, the behavior of all the bodies of the universe. These considerations suggest systems of events, and the idea of a total world event. This is what is meant by saying that the universe is one total event. Now, we do adjust ourselves more or less successfully to this total world event; and the problem of life is to make this adjustment as best we can.

We adjust ourselves to the behavior of the sun, when we plant our corn in the spring and sow our wheat in the fall. We adjust ourselves to the weather, when we put on our overcoats and put up our umbrellas when we go out in a snow storm. All these adjustments bring benefits; but there is one adjustment which brings supreme benefits, and one event which has these consequences. We know that there is such event, because we experience the consequences. We may call this event God, and define God as that event adjustment to which brings the greatest fulness of life. But to speak of God as an event is a wide and radical departure from the idea that God is the Absolute and Eternal Being that changeth not, the Source of all changes and of all events, the Creator.

This doctrine, that the universe is a total event, and that God is an event of special importance for man's welfare, suggests another idea of God. According to our usual habits of thought, an event is the behavior of something. Animal behavior is the behavior of certain bodies. The strange behavior of the weather is the behavior of the wind and rain, of heat and cold, etc., and is traceable to the behavior of the earth and the sun. The stars behave by shining out from the depths of space. The various ways in which the things of the world behave are endless. Putting them all together we may say that the universe is behavior. Now, according to the view which the author is setting forth, there is, within this total body of behavior called the universe, one mode of supreme importance to man, and this behavior is God. In other words, God is the most important part of the behavior of the universe; and our adjustment to it is the business of the religious life.

The idea of God as behavior may be less shocking to our religious sensibilities and to our habits of religious thought, than the idea that He is a feature of the environment, or that He is an event. Inasmuch as every existing thing has some mode of behavior, even existence itself a mode of behavior, it may not be wholly inappropriate to speak of

God as behavior; but at the same time we should bear in mind that in this way of speaking the word behavior is extended quite beyond its proper metaphysical range. It may be permissible to define God as that which behaves in a certain way; but God is more than behavior, just as a man is more than his behavior. As man is a quality or state, an affection of love, which expresses itself in behavior, so God is the State of Love which expresses itself in the creative act.

This whole mode of thought which attempts to define God as a "feature of the environment," as an "event," as "behavior," is obviously a refined naturalism, however these expressions may be further qualified by giving them special, or even supreme, importance for the welfare of man. They are taken from the external world of bodies; and the notion of body is the fundamental principle of both naturalism and materialism. The environment is known as the behavior of bodies; and the various modes of the behavior are the events of the environment. It is characteristic of Aristotelian metaphysics to refer qualities to substances, and the properties and behavior of the physical world to bodies, and ultimately to matter. But modern physics tends in its analysis to resolve bodies into centers of force, so that the notion of body and even the notion of matter seem to vanish. It is the outcome of this metaphysics that enables some philosophers to speak prematurely of events and behavior quite apart from the thing whose behavior is the event. Similarly, Bergson speaks of motion apart from the thing that moves. Such language is only justified by a metaphysics which transforms the Aristotelian doctrine of substance, as well the appearances of common sense, together with our notions of body and matter.

The vague application of the terms "environment," "event," "behavior," etc., to define God, leads to a materialistic universalism which conceives of God as a sort of universal atmosphere pressing down upon men and nature with certain effects. We may imagine, if we choose, that the author's idea of God, and his description of man's rela-

tion to God—much of it admirable and helpful—will in the end lead to a more spiritual view. But we must observe that this body of thought neglects any use of the Bible as a means of getting a knowledge of God. And yet the Bible gives the most complete description of God and of man's relation to God to be found anywhere in the whole body of literature. Take the Book of Psalms and put together in systematic order what is said about God there, and you will be surprised at the completeness of the theology.

The author had the needed opportunity to pass over to a more spiritual idea of God, when he fell back on love as the experience which best exemplifies the nature of mysticism and of religion. He speaks of love as the full-orbed life, but does not follow up the clue.

As Swedenborg says, we pass from ideas of the space-time world to the world of spirit, when we pass to the idea of states of love and wisdom. It is generally recognized that there is nothing more real than love and wisdom, but not generally recognized that love and wisdom are the source of all reality, of all behavior and of all events. A few years ago, a book appeared and had great popularity which developed the theme that love is the greatest thing in the world. This, however, is very far from saying that the world is love. That God is love is familiar Christian doctrine, but a doctrine that Christians have been too prone to forget. Nevertheless, it is profoundly and demonstratively true both that God is love and that the world is love. Swedenborg says that angels are loves and wisdoms; he would add that the same is true of men, with the qualification, they are either that, or perverted forms of love and wisdom. He also says that if you look around and examine things in interior light, you will see that they are so full of love and wisdom that they may be said to be love and wisdom. We may say, then, that the universe is love; but this proposition implies a highly developed metaphysics. One of the most important doctrines of mediæval philosophy was, that the grades of logical generality correspond with grades of existence. It

was this doctrine that lead to the famous mediæval controversy over universals, and to the issue between realism and nominalism, an issue which survives in the debate between the present day idealists and realists. The persistence of this controversy is enough to show the importance of the problems in dispute.

One of the most important things to know about love is, that there are various degrees of it, various grades of generality. There are particular loves; there are more general loves; there are more universal loves. For example, we correctly speak of the love of individuals, the love of the family circle, the love of the community, the love of the state, the love of humanity. Perhaps some of us have an experience of these several grades of love. Or again, we have the love of science in general, the love of biology or mathematics, the love of botany or geometry, etc. We might illustrate the principle almost endlessly. The important fact is, we have some experience of love in these various grades of generality.

If we start out with the thought of God as love, we make a beginning of forming a spiritual idea of Him, and of men and the world. First of all, we think of God as infinite love, love which not only has no limits, but has an infinity of subordinate loves within it. We have a beautiful and simple illustration of this in the number system. The system of positive whole numbers is not only itself infinite, but it has within it an infinity of infinite number systems—for example, the odd numbers, the even numbers, every third number, etc. But God is not only infinite love, he is the love of this particular universe which He has created. In other words, Infinite Love is specialized in the act of creating this whole world. So the love of this world as a whole is within Infinite Love, and is the most universal love. Within this universal love again there are loves of less universal comprehension; such as the love of heaven, the love of mankind, the love of external nature, etc. So then we may begin with man's particular loves, and rise by grades of generality to

the love which is God; then we may descend by grades of generality from Infinite Love to the least particulars of love.

There is another most important observation to be made as to the nature of love; that it is an organism, and at the grade which constitutes man, love is a person. Otherwise, personality is the form of love. In scholastic terms, love is the principle of individuation, a doctrine which Professor Royce appropriated. In simple terms, love is man, or a man. This means that God is man, and because He is man, we are men.

It is an interesting and important feature of modern philosophy, that there is a perceptible tendency in it towards this metaphysics of love. When the tendency becomes a developed method, much of the naturalism and materialism of the day will be overcome, and religious thought will advance to a spiritual level. The books before us are good specimens of the kind of thinking we find in advanced circles; and we should become familiar with it.

LEWIS F. HITE.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

CONVENTION

The late Convention, assembled at Washington about the middle of May, was one of unusual interest. Washington is a beautiful and delightful city, and the church is one of the beautiful objects of the city. The commodious rooms of the parish house afforded ample convenience for social enjoyment; and the nearby hotel, the Cairo, enabled a large part of the Convention people to be together. In view of these attractions, it was to be expected that there would be a full attendance; and certainly the overflowing congregation at the Sunday morning services was highly gratifying.

The discussions both in the Council of Ministers and in the Convention proper were earnest and spirited. Some of the papers and addresses were of special merit and importance. The Rev. H. Gordon Drummond, representative of the British Conference, contributed happily and substantially to the discussions. As the proceedings have been published in the *Messenger,* there is no occasion for us to attempt summaries.

The Convention, as the general meeting of the Church in its organized capacity, is important most of all perhaps for promoting the feeling of solidarity, and for the experience it gives of the organized efficiency of the Church. This experience is especially important for the smaller, more remote, societies, and for the isolated members. For such, the Church is to a greater or less extent ideal; it arouses profound sentiments of appreciation and loyalty, and it is thought of rather as a body of abstract principles than as an organized working and worshipping body of ordinary men, women, and children. The larger societies, on the contrary, are apt to place the emphasis on the

concrete organized body rather than on the abstract principles. The isolated and the remote, therefore, get peculiar and important benefits in coming to the large gathering of the Convention; the social, intellectual, and religious atmosphere becomes a real and happy experience to them, as it does in fact to all who attend. The culminating feature of the Convention is always the Sunday morning worship. It seemed on this occasion that the uplifting sphere of the body was felt more than ever, and that the united strength of the Convention was renewed.

The prevailing temper of Convention as expressed in the papers, the discussions, and in conversation, seemed to be earnestly directed to progressive effort. It was generally recognized that the Church is facing very serious and critical conditions. The Council of Ministers had in view the requirements of the situation in the field of ministerial work. The election of the officers and boards of the Convention had in view the conditions in the larger field of administrative policy. The new President, whose knowledge of the Church at large is perhaps unsurpassed, will be looked to for helpful guidance in all the fields of Church activity.

The situation in Convention and in the Church is most seriously complicated by influences, religious, intellectual, and social, of the outside world. Much anxiety was expressed in Convention, and presumably much is felt throughout the Church, at the lack of growth and at the appearance of decline. But if we compare our condition with that of the many Protestant denominations, it seems that what we really have to meet is a world-wide religious disturbance. We have heard now and then for some years dismal prophecies about the dissolution of the Protestant Churches. These prophecies have in recent years become more and more insistent, and more common. Elaborate statistics have been collected to show the decline of religious interest and of church attendance; students of history and of present tendencies are soberly declaring that Christianity is doomed to extinction. There seems to be a growing con-

viction that science is displacing religion as a guide to life. Whether we give full credit to these reports and prophecies or not, there are obvious facts which we must recognize and deal with. Some believe that we are in a transition stage from outworn forms to new light, new principles, and new achievements. There is a breaking away from traditions, especially religious traditions; and there is a turning towards the future with hope and confidence, sometimes with claims of newly acquired possessions. In the meantime, the facts are before us, and they are disturbing.

We are taught that the state of marriage is the real test of the quality of human life and of a civilization. Applying that test to the life of today, we find wretchedness, unhappiness, and restlessness, where there should be joy, peace, and contentment. As evidence of this, it is estimated that there is one divorce to every seven marriages throughout the country. This means that married life in this "the most prosperous country in the world" is in this proportion a failure. This failure, perhaps the worst and most seriously menacing feature of our present-day life, is traceable to a great extent to conditions which are peculiar to our time. Whatever the explanation, marriage is too often entered upon with wrong ideas, wrong sentiments, and wrong purposes. The consequence is, that the ties of natural affection are broken in the course of trial, temptation, and disillusion. Natural affection is not sufficiently grounded in moral and spiritual principles, nor elevated by moral and spiritual ideals. Among the conditions unfavorable to happy married life, we may point first of all to the present and obsessing naturalistic egoism, which is generated and fortified by perverted philosophizing. The ill-understood principle of "self expression," the extravagant demand to "live one's own life," the misdirected assertion of "woman's rights," are all combined in a radical and unrestricted individualism which is inimical to the self-surrender and mutual co-operation of the complete marriage union. The increasing severity of the modern struggle for existence tends to make the thought of marriage formidable, and emphasizes the requirements of material

existence. The narrowing quarters of urban life make family life inconvenient and too often intolerable. It is under such conditions that the Church must bring help to people; and this applies to the New Church as well as to others. We need first of all to bring them our teachings about marriage, which involve fundamental teachings about the real nature of man, and about man's relation to God. This means teachings about the nature of Divine and human love.

The case as to marriage is typical of the low morality of the community. The rejection of moral and religious principles, and the adoption of naturalism and egoism, have given extraordinary impetus to self-seeking, self-indulgence, and dissipation. These are the conditions that face the Church, and infect the Church membership. They are so obvious as to be unheeded; but they are all the more effective for this reason.

There are other influences which poison the life-blood of our Church. They are the currents of thought and feeling that flood the press, and flow through the spoken word from pulpit and platform. Apart from the low and degraded sensationalism exploited on every hand, the thought of the day is permeated with undigested naturalistic and rationalistic philosophies, the tendency of which is to undermine both morality and religion. The principles, reasoning, and methods of natural science are heedlessly transferred to moral and religious thinking, and are incorporated in our daily lives. Through the familiar and undiscriminating contact with this body of thought, pressing like a boundless atmosphere into every pore of our being, we absorb it until it becomes the tissue of our mental life. The results appear in our speech, in our writing, and in our preaching. What we need is a *critical* familiarity with the thought of the day, so that we may profit by what is true and valuable in it, and avoid what is noxious. This of itself is no easy task, but it is one of the tasks that we face.

Not only our practical life and our intellectual integrity are threatened and infected by the omnipresence of the influences of the world, but the clearness and purity of our religious thought are endangered and corrupted. The religious thought

of the present day under the pressure of naturalism and rationalism is showing a general drift towards Unitarianism. This Unitarian drift appears in all the Protestant bodies, even among the Trinitarians, although Trinitarianism offers some protection and a firm obstacle against the encroachments of Unitarianism. The habit of patronizing and lauding "the Jesus of the Gospels" is becoming more and more common, and more characteristic, in the preaching and writing of the day. We should not be misled by it. No doubt there is much that is genuine in the Christian worship of the day. Christian tradition, Christian discourse, and above all Christian hymns, have given us a familiar Christian vocabulary, which is appropriated and used by all religious denominations, and especially by popular preaching; but such language is acquiring a new meaning. As long as Jesus Christ of the Gospels was identified with the Eternal Son of God, as is done in the Trinitarian doctrine, there could be genuine worship of the Lord as in some sense God; but when this Eternal Sonship is denied, as is done in Unitarianism, all genuine worship ceases. The Lord becomes the son of man, and increasingly the son of Joseph. In this view, the Lord is the son of God in the sense that all men are sons of God who live in and from God. There is added this somewhat doubtful qualification, that He, because of His exceeding moral excellence and spiritual elevation, became worthy to be called the son of God in an exalted sense. The result is that the Lord is not worshipped as God, but is lauded as a man who manifested the nature of God as fully as it could be manifested in human nature. As a matter of fact, prayer to God for Christ's sake is not only the accepted formula, but it is precisely descriptive of the relation of Christ to God in the religious thought of the day. Our hymn book and our preaching appropriate much of the traditional language of the Christian Church, and for the most part the language is fitting and beautiful, especially when it is interpreted figuratively and in terms of our doctrines. But we should use such language with due caution, otherwise we inadvertently slip over into the thought which prevails in the churches about us. There is a con-

stant temptation to do this. In the first place, it is easier to express ourselves in the vocabulary which is in common use. Our proper vocabulary is little used in ordinary speech, and is difficult to acquire and to master. How else could it be the vehicle of a new dispensation? On the other hand, we must use the language of the people if we are to be heard by the people. Consequently, we are urged to abandon our technical language and our dogmatic speech, and put the meaning of our vocabulary into language which the people can understand. This is precisely our task; but it is just the meaning of our vocabulary that we fail to get and to convey, when we fall into the language of traditional Christianity and the language of our popular orators and writers. Whatever our intention, the thing we actually do is to repeat the thought that belongs to the language we use. Our proper task is entirely different from this. It is not to translate our speech into the language of the day. It is the much more difficult, more important, more vital, task of translating the thought contained in our speech into the terms of actual experience. It is quite true that our experience has much in common with the experience of the world at large, and especially with the general body of Christians; but there is, or at least there is the possibility of, a type of experience which is peculiar to New-Churchmen, the kind of experience in feeling, thought, and act which a life in the full light of our doctrines would give us. A close reading of the "Arcana Cœlestia" will bring to view an immense amount of such experience. This is our task: to attain such experience, and then describe it in language best suited to express it.

Our doctrine of love needs above all to be grasped and expounded. There are, as we know, two ruling forms of love: love for the Lord, and love for the neighbor; distinguished in the two great commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself." These two loves with their perversions, love of self and love of the world, include all the possibilities of love; for all others are particulars derived from

these. For us ordinarily the love of the neighbor and the love of the world are very obscurely distinguished; for one reason, that the love of the world is a perversion of the love of the neighbor. This perversion is a constant temptation for us; and it is a temptation which we have not succeeded in overcoming. Our history is evidence of this. In spite of our positive doctrine of use, the love of the world has done more to hinder our progress than any other adverse influence,—perhaps more than all the other adverse influences put together. We have suffered from mistaken methods, from misleading ideas, from the lack of devoted study and systematic grasp of our doctrines, from inadequate presentation of our doctrines, and from neglect of intelligent practice of them. But if we look into the history of our leading New-Church families, we shall find that worldly attraction, worldly position, and worldly interests, have robbed us of our heritage in almost every case. Some have left the Church and gone over into the world, and into other religious denominations, on the plea that they could do more good there than in the New Church. Children have lost interest and left the Church from sheer indifference. Others have yielded to the encircling pressure of the world. Presumably, the lack of due parental instruction and influence is responsible for a large part of such results. In any case, the situation points to a primary and imperative need for an adequate system of New-Church education. The Convention has come closer to Urbana University of late, and the prospect is good for a revival of interest in that institution on the part of the Church people generally.

This survey of the influences, adverse and otherwise, to which the Convention and the Church are subject, may serve to emphasize certain aspects of the work which they have undertaken to do for the world. The Convention is the organized agent for doing what the Church as a whole wants done. Individuals and local societies cannot do such work conveniently, nor as well. The thought, the sentiment, the purpose of the Church must be expressed in and through an organized body, a body organized for worship and for administration.

Loyalty to the Church body is the fit expression of loyalty to the Lord in His Second Coming. It is one function of the Convention to attract and promote such loyalty.

LEWIS F. HITE.

THE CHURCH OF THE SECOND COMING

Twice recently it has fallen to the writer's lot to be regarded as a rabbi because of his connection with "The Church of the New Jerusalem." The designation has carried suggestions of Jewish affiliations widely and long. Misleading suggestion attaches to the Church's official name. There is probably no other usual mode of reference to the Church, either, which is not open to some misunderstanding. The popular and newspaper designation "Swedenborgian" has implied to some that the Church is made up of people of Swedish antecedents. Very casual acquaintances have thought that Swedish was the language in which the services are conducted. And we have felt more serious objections to the use of that name, of which in a moment. As for the practice among ourselves of calling our organization the New Church, that designation is not informing to others. It is not a descriptive term, really. New church buildings are what come to mind most readily. Or no impression is made, except uncertainty what can be meant. How confusing the term is, is plain from our own re-action when we read in the table of contents of a periodical the subject "Making the New Church College." It could well refer to some big project of ours, but does not. Our Church, moreover, is not as new as some other churches, like the Christian Science Church; while some that we call old, are as new as we, like the Methodist Church. It is to be freely conceded, that not much is more haphazard and less penetrating to essentials than most church names. Sometimes they are given a body by its enemies; sometimes they are references to something altogether incidental in a church's outlook and character. Yet it is also to be allowed that a name really reflective of a

church's character and message would already be a proclamation of what it has to say.

Agitation for re-naming our organization bobs up every so often. When it only calls attention to misleading results of present names, it cannot expect to make a point. But we might profitably consider possible other names.

Whatever we call our organization, or whatever others may call it for their better convenience, our Church in fact is the Church of the Second Coming. If the Lord had not, as we think He has, come again, there would be no such Church as ours. The New Church builds on the conviction that the Lord has come the second time, and that He has spoken by a prepared servant a message re-casting Christianity for the present day. It is a bold conviction, but it feels itself wholly warranted. The message it finds uttered in the Theological Works of Swedenborg it cannot ascribe to Swedenborg. He did not. It seemed to him revelation from the Lord. It has struck New-Churchmen so. It is as true to say then that, were it not for the Second Coming, there would be no New Church, as it was for Paul to say that, had the Lord not risen, there would in the first instance have proved to be no Christianity. On that thesis the Church starts off. And what it is looking toward, and what alone renders it a "new" church, is that the Lord has come again to set up the kingdom He preached, or the spiritual life, as we say, anew.

Would we not be calling the Church what it is, if we called it the Church of the Second Coming?

Are there not advantages to be had from the designation? Are there any disadvantages?

In the first place, among advantages, the name is certainly apt, as we have said. It goes to the bottom of our corporate existence. If the Lord has not really come the second time, we have no message, and no reason for being. It is because He has done so, as we believe, that we do exist, and have something to say. What could lead us to stand more squarely on the premise of fact underlying our existence than to call ourselves "The Church of the Second Coming"?

Secondly, there is a stir and a challenge in that designation. We ask people to consider that the Lord may have come again. We ask them, not to try just another religious organization, to see what more it can do for them than other churches; what we feel we are challenged to, and what we feel we may challenge others to, is a real adventure—a fresh following of the Lord in the Christian life as He offers that life in increased abundance and with better understanding. A new era is breaking for Christianity, if the Lord has come again. The name proposed would intimate as much. It would challenge to the essential cause. It would have some chance of stirring the blood of the seeker after timely Divine aid and leading.

Again, our whole movement would be assigned an historical basis in such a name. Christianity has for one of its sources of strength, that it has such a comprehensive rootage in the actual history of the planet—in an Incarnate Divine life lived among men, which became the central episode in the planet's history. But any second coming will be historical fact. We do go out saying it is historical fact. "The Church of the Second Coming" would itself begin to hint to the public mind that we regard the Second Coming for consummated fact. It would intimate that we have not simply a body of doctrine to offer, or divergent ideas, or a different mode of worship, which are the usual differences among churches; but that at least we think that we start off on a newly laid basis of fact, as did Christianity at first. It had the fact to proclaim that the Christ was come. We have the fact to proclaim that He has made and is making His promised second coming. The uniqueness in our existence, as well as the warrant for it, lies there. That basis of fact should be pushed forward on attention; what the New Church is all about is not otherwise apparent. But the name "The Church of the Second Coming" begins itself to do it.

I find a fourth strong reason for the use of such a name in the consideration, that it throws authority, yes, authorship for the Church, where it belongs, if the Church is real at all. The Lord has not come the second time because Swedenborg

says so. We think so because through Swedenborg such a depth of the Word has been uncovered that we can only believe the Lord has disclosed His own mind further. That disclosure of His mind also seems promised in the predictions the Lord made at the first coming that He would come again. That is, the New Church rests itself back finally on the Lord's own words, saying that He would come again. He is the final sanction Himself of our position, if we have any sanction for being. When we refer to the Church as the Swedenborgian Church, there is every implication that Swedenborg founded it. But if it is the Church of the Second Coming, and the Lord has come again, the Lord is the founder, in being the initiator of a new day in Christianity. The use of that name puts the warrant for the Church's existence where indeed, in all logic, it is.

So we speak of the Book of *Revelation,* beyond the Theological Works of Swedenborg, as "the charter of the New Church." In its spiritual sense that Book has reference to this day. It speaks of a first era concluded, of Catholic and Protestant development. It describes other-world judgments on a Christianity gone astray. It predicts a new Christianity coming in, under the impulsion of the Lord's further revelation of Himself. This new era of Christian growth is the New Jerusalem. It is one argument against the use of that glorious designation for any religious body, that it is the name of a whole new movement of Christian life and thought, an "age," a new "world," a "dispensation," which no one body can be, or any number together. In that world and development there will be no more crying, or pain, or death, and no one will see it who makes a lie or breaks a commandment; but where is the religious body of which these things can be asserted? There is not only a degree of presumption in taking, for a religious body of mixed character, of nominal membership, of usual unregenerateness, all of which are inevitable, the name of a new era; but there is no name left then for the shining reality toward which we are all pressing. But back on that last Book of the Bible we do rest for the vision which has called us to-

gether. There the Lord is pictured as coming again to the aid of His Church; and the Church is pictured as crying to Him, "Come." The name "The Church of the Second Coming" would carry men's minds back to the Scripture words that warrant the great hope, and that are the final dependence for our corporate existence as a Church. The Lord has come to bring in a new day for Christianity—we throw ourselves upon His promise to do so: the name, "The Church of the Second Coming," suggests as much.

Do we take in what a fine starting-point the name would make for explanations of what our Church stands for? It is an admirable opener for a conversation on the question. That is a fifth thing in its favor.

John: To what church did you say you belong?

Frederick: To "The Church of the Second Coming."

J.: I don't know that I ever heard of it, if that's the exact name. Adventists I've heard of.

F.: No; this is "The Church of the Second Coming."

J.: What does it stand for?

F.: That to begin with. The Lord, we think, has come the second time.

J.: "Has"? How? You'd think that would be widely known.

F.: We think He has come not by showing Himself again in any physical re-appearance on earth, but by showing us more of His mind.

J.: But, again, how?

F.: By letting us deeper into the Scriptures, in which His mind is the eternal content.

J.: That's rather to the point, I'll say. Of course if He came again in a physical way, there would be no good in that until He spoke. If He has actually spoken again, without the physical re-appearance, that is the essential matter, and all that is necessary. But how do it?

F.: By training up a spokesman. We think Emanuel Swedenborg, of whom you may have heard, under the Lord brought new meanings out of the Scriptures for our better

guidance today. He also summed up its plainer teachings in a great body of carefully stated teaching. For a third thing, he let us know something of the world beyond. In these three things—disclosures about the spiritual world, re-casting of the Christian message, and revelation of a depth of unsuspected meaning and beauty in the Word—Swedenborg served to let the Lord enter on this world to usher in a new day for Christianity.

J.: It's a bold position to take. What a lift it would be to believe it! Really suppose that we were not left in these changing days, with their upset notions and standards, to cast about for ourselves on age-old foundations; but that these were relaid, and we had the Lord's leadership in any definite guise to try the new days with! I wonder if it can be taken seriously. It means some different ideas of things, of course?

F.: You mean about the world? Life? God? The Bible? Yes, indeed. All manner of new light. I think you would find that the message bears out the claim made for it.

J.: You really think He has come again—Jesus? I'm going to sit down to it with you, Fred. If Christianity is an adventure, as they're saying these days, I'll grant you nothing could give it that character more thrillingly than the possibility that Christ Himself is actually creating the adventure and leading off in it. I want to know about it.

There are three things to be said of such a supposed colloquy: it swings around a possible fact; it keeps to a concrete happening—Swedenborg's work, and the message by him; and it raises visions of the actual and thrilling thing that is forward—a new Christian day, with which we can all have a pioneering and adventuring hand. One is not immediately entangled in intricacies and depths of doctrines. One doesn't get taken back to the middle eighteenth century, but is faced forward. Not every inquirer will be as tractable and ready as the supposititious J.; but the title, "The Church of the Second Coming," makes an admirable starting point for discussing what the New Church is all about.

Are there no disadvantages in the name? No drawbacks?

It is too much to expect that there should not be. It will be enough if they are not too serious. Perhaps they are offset more readily than misleading aspects of present names.

Of course there is the confusion with Adventist bodies and teachings, though there is a slight avoidance of that confusion already in not using "advent" but "coming" in the name. But suppose the name meant to others that we believed in a physical re-appearance of the Lord, or put off the Coming to the future, or expected it fanatically any moment in a catastrophic form; those notions are all easily dealt with in any first explanation of the name. What is more, as we deal with them, we are already rehearsing our message, what we stand for. But if we say, "We are not Jews, no," or "We are not worshippers of the man Swedenborg," etc., we have yet to begin saying what we do stand for. That is, the name proposed gets us faster to things that matter. And one of the things we can welcome opportunity to say is, that we think the Lord comes the second time in a disclosure of His mind, or in spirit, and that we do not put the Coming off to an indefinite future, where it concerns us little, but find it a contemporary mercy, where it signifies much, etc. Confusions created by the name "The Church of the Second Coming" have to do with the message, and are confusions profitably cleared up.

I can think of but one other drawback—not wholly another one, either. People will think we harp on one idea—the Lord's return. We throw the general message of Christianity out of symmetry, and make one rather vague hope our whole interest. Well, it is easy to explain we do not. And again the explanation gets us on the way at once in telling our story. That the Lord has come again is really not a leading doctrine of ours. Teachings about the Lord's Person and presence, about the Word, about human life and its regenerate possibilities, and about human destiny, these are leading doctrines. The Second Coming is not a doctrine strictly, with us, leading or otherwise. It is a premise of fact on which we are starting out. The first Christians had a fact to preach—the Christ had come. That was no doctrine. We have a fact to proclaim—

the Lord has made and is making His Second Coming. The fact is only the way to welcoming a message of endless moment and of that enlightening power that only the mind of the Lord, re-revealed, can have. Getting over the fact is getting over a threshold into a new Christian age. That age and its possibilities is what mainly interests us, not everlastingly insisting that the threshold is there. But let men know the door has been flung open. This name will help do it—"The Church of the Second Coming." WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

BIBLE TRANSLATIONS AND TRANSLATION

Still the Bible translations come! We have had the opportunity lately to look into two of the most recent. One is the whole Bible in the very able translation done by Dr. Moffat. The other is the Old Testament in the attractive American Translation offered by the University of Chicago Press, and done by four men. We do not mean to review either rendering. But a thought suggested itself with new force. After all, there is every reason for one kind of translation of the Bible for general use and enjoyment, and for a quite different kind of translation when one wants to go about the exposition of the deeper sense of Scripture. No one has yet made a study of a rather interesting and, it may be, vital question. Perhaps the question has not been raised. Is the exposition of the spiritual sense of the Word in the Theological Works based on the letter of Scripture, or on the literal sense, or on both? It can at least be said that for his own exposition of the deeper sense Swedenborg required the letter, and the letter as faithfully rendered as possible. He re-translates his Scriptures throughout his main expository works. It can also be said that the clarification and full rendering of the sense of the letter was not his aim. His translation was in the interest of the spiritual sense, that is, of getting more completely at that sense.

Swedenborg recognized that each sense has its own subjects, series and sequences. On that theory translation to bring out one or the other sense is really called for, and not only war-

ranted. A translation which may differ in manner very much from his is needed to give all its force, beauty and clarity to the historical sense of Scripture. One wants then to translate to do one's best by the literal sense and message. Many a new translation surpasses the official versions in this respect at many points. And they depart far enough often from the rendering that might be most transparent or precise in the task of interpreting the deeper sense. Rather oddly, textual precision and literal fidelity is most in order for the deeper sense which, however, is not verbal, while for the first or literal meaning a larger freedom in translation becomes not only possible but is the only literary or substantial justice. At *Genesis* xxx. 30 (to illustrate) Swedenborg translates "Jehovah hath blessed thee at my foot"—which makes none too plain sense, but is the exact wording and idiom of the Hebrew original which Swedenborg wants for the basis of his interpretation. That differs more from any of the following renderings than the latter do among themselves, yet the first meaning is better brought out in any of the following:

The Lord hath blessed thee since my coming. (AV.)
Jehovah hath blessed thee whithersoever I turned. (RV, Am.)
Wherever I have turned, the Eternal has blessed you. (Moffat.)
The Lord blessed you upon my arrival. (The Old Testament, An American Translation, 1927.)

Rightly enough, if each sense, the spiritual and the literal, has its own series, sequences and subjects, the manner of translation for the sake of the one and the other can be expected to differ.

Wm. F. Wunsch.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

A DIGEST OF THE TEACHING ON "CHARITY" (I.)

Swedenborg would seem to have summed up his teaching himself on "Charity." There is that excellent posthumous work, fragmentary as it is in many respects, "The Doctrine of Charity". (Nothing in the Theological Works can serve better as a handbook of practical religion, or of "applied Christianity".) Then there is the chapter on Charity in Swedenborg's summary of the teaching of the New Church, "True Christian Religion." There is also the forerunner of that chapter in the chapter on the subject in "The New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine." Appended to the latter chapter is a digest of the "Arcana" on the same theme. Nor should it be overlooked that in "The Doctrine of Life" Swedenborg is on the same subject. There is every appearance, therefore, that he himself offers digest enough of what he has to say on that particular topic.

Digests are useful, of course, of the teaching on topics on which he makes no sweeping assemblage of teaching, as on the subject of the church, for example. But even where, as here, he has made some comprehensive statements of teaching there will be ramifications which he will not have brought into a summary. A variation on his order of presentation will also bring out unnoticed associations of ideas, and throw a new light on the whole subject. In this paper it is not so much a finished digest of what the Theological Works have to say on "Charity" that we are offering, but running suggestions for such a digest. In general, an analysis and digest of what is said on any one topic will prove useful to teacher and minister, and to an occasional lay teacher of a doctrinal class.

It would be natural in such a digest to indicate first of

all the Scripture foundations for the teachings. For every teaching of the New Church has been elaborated from the sense of the letter of the Word, and can be rested back on it. But we shall leave this natural first step to the last. We leave it until last because it is not a part properly of a digest of what Swedenborg says. One has to go behind what he says for these Scripture foundations. Swedenborg rarely pursues his Scripture formulation in the sight of his reader. That has been done beforehand. In his open and public text he is stating his results, and putting the accomplished formulation. The modes of arrival at it on the basis of Scripture are hidden in the processes of his study, and in unpublished (by him) Bible notebooks. But when we have assembled his teaching, we shall examine this underlying and preliminary Bible work, as an addendum to the actual digest of his teaching.

I. The Meaning of "Charity"

1. We ask first naturally what Swedenborg means by the word "Charity" as he employs it. We shall see that he employs it with larger and with more restricted meanings. It is his term for "love to the neighbor." What he has to say of the second great motive of the spiritual life will be found gathered in the "Swedenborg Concordance," for instance, far more extensively under "charity" than under "love to the neighbor." Still more when he speaks of the life of charity, he gives the term a broad reference; the life of charity is identical with the spiritual life. But he also regards charity much more narrowly, as only one element in that life. It is a twin-element along with faith in the regenerate character. As such, or as a definite psychological quantity in the religious experience, he defines it the most closely. He says of it then, that it is "the affection of being of service to others without an end of recompense" (Arcana Cœlestia, n.3419(3)). It is then a thing deep in a person, an affection of his inner life. So in "Arcana," n.8033, he calls it an internal affection—"willing from the heart to do what is good to the neighbor, and this without recompense." Disinterested well-doing comes near to paraphrasing it. Swedenborg is therefore often on charity's

being "averse to merit" (ibid., n.3956); the man of charity is "without fear of merit," i.e., is without fear that he will ascribe to himself the good he does (True Christian Religion, n.442(2)). The disinterestedness extends to the disinterested pursuit of truth (New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine, n.106(2)); charity contains in itself "the willing of truth" (Arcana Cœlestia, n.3877); and this disinterested love of truth is pictured as topping off charity (True Christian Religion, n.799). How much charity is this high disinterestedness is plain in "Arcana," n.8122. Charity is opposite to love of self (ibid., n.4776); it becomes in the higher heavens a love of the neighbor more than self (ibid., nn.3956, 4286(2)). It must be the delight one finds in disinterested living that makes it hard to put charity into words (ibid., n.7131e). On this definition of charity in its essence the student will find "Arcana" nn.4956, 5132(2), and 4538(4) noteworthy, too. The definition is not altered, but less explicit, when "The Doctrine of Faith," n.13, calls charity "an affection of good." or n.14 "an affection of use," or "Arcana," n.379, "the willing of good." All these definitions seek out charity as it lies in the breast, a motive, the large impulsion, of the regenerating character. We need to realise that first of all Swedenborg goes *in* for the thing to which he gives the name "charity." It is a psychological quantity, one of the chief elements of the spiritual life.

It is hardly necessary to say, then, that charity is not to him first of all a way of acting toward the needy, or helpfulness to the helpless. Nor is it tolerance, or "charitableness"; that will be merely one trait it manifests. He leaves trait and outward conduct, and searches the heart for what he denominates by the word. He will be saying before long how charity expresses itself in the life of action, and what traits it means in the character; but first of all it is this source of all real doing for any one else—"the *affection* of being of service to others without an end of recompense."

2. While Swedenborg singles "charity" out in this way as one of the elements of the regenerate character, "faith" be-

ing the other ranking with it, he also makes the word "charity" stand for the spiritual life in general, when it means the life of both charity and faith, and instead of being contrasted with faith, is inclusive of it. Especially is this true when he speaks of "the life of charity." Is that not the equivalent absolutely of the spiritual life? Sometimes he breaks the spiritual life up into the life of charity and the life of piety; but in the larger use of the phrase, "the life of charity" carries both designations. So the first of "charity," which is to avoid evil, and the second of charity, which is to do good, are just as much the first of the "spiritual life" and the second of the "spiritual life," as told in the "Doctrine of Life." In "Divine Providence," n.259(3), "the life of charity" is the third of the three essentials of "the church," and obviously is the spiritual life, otherwise so-called. So "True Christian Religion," n.12, says God, charity, and faith are the three essentials. "The New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine," n.106(2e), says in so many words, that "charity" means the "spiritual life."

But, sweeping as this seems, it is to be remembered that under "the spiritual life" Swedenborg is thinking of the regenerate life of the spiritual type, not of the celestial. He still has a restriction in mind. The "spiritual life" is that type of regeneration in which charity, i.e., regard to the neighbor, is the characteristic motive. So "spiritual good" is "charity," while "celestial good" is the regenerate life inspired by love to the Lord (Apocalypse Explained, n.240). At this point one can bring into a digest many interesting side inquiries on which Swedenborg speaks out in scattered places.

Was there not, and is there not, charity in the celestial type of the regenerate life? Yes; but it was differently reached in the Most Ancient Church, to take an example of the "celestial," from the arrival at it in the Ancient Church. Faith became the road to it in the latter (Arcana, nn.310(2), 335, 336, 337e.—the student will also want to examine here nn.393, 615, 654, 1023(2)). The difference is succinctly put in "Arcana," n.2088(3): charity is now an affection of truth. Or,

"good done from charity is done from the understanding" (ibid., n.2196(7)). Or, "the celestial were introduced by charity into the love of the Lord, while the spiritual are introduced by truths of faith into charity" (ibid., n.3122).

Is this distinction between characteristic motives in celestial and spiritual types of the regenerate life to be taken to mean that charity is anything apart from love to the Lord? There are many passages of moment on the relation of the two. Charity, or regard to the neighbor, cannot be separated from love to the Lord (Arcana, n.2023); it has that love in it (ibid., n.10336(5)), though the man is unaware of the fact (New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine, n.106(8)); charity proceeds from it (Arcana, n.1873), is its offspring (ibid., n.362), or is "a lower degree of it" (ibid., n.615).

But there is no mistaking that in charity Swedenborg has in view primarily spiritual life of the type he finds in the "second heaven". The "spiritual" are those who have charity by way of faith and the knowledges of faith (Arcana, n.459e). Those of the spiritual kingdom are those who are in charity (ibid., nn.3635, 4286(2)). A spiritual church is one acting from charity (ibid., n.916(2)). The spiritual are saved by charity (ibid., n.2839). "Arcana," n.3969(2,4,10,17), has much to offer on this head. Throughout, the student has to keep his mind up to the meaning assigned charity—disinterested well-doing towards others, or better, disinterested well-wishing that is efficient.

II. How Vitally Significant Charity is for Swedenborg

Whether charity is read as the specific motive of regard to the neighbor, or as the whole life which it results in, but still the individual's *inner* life, it is to Swedenborg a momentous matter.

1. Charity, he feels, got lost out of traditional Christian teaching. That ran to being a doctrine of faith, not of charity and faith. And here one has to take in what he means by the distinction. You do not have a doctrine of charity and faith when you get one that deals with charity as well as with faith,

or that urges charity as well as faith. If, for instance, one says from mere principle that charity is primary, that is not reaching the point (Spiritual Diary, n.5881). A doctrine of faith is one in which the mind moves in the region of things to be believed. It has to do with articles of belief, and one of those articles may be that there is such a thing as charity, and that it is the primary thing in the spiritual life. But a doctrine of charity moves out of theological propositions into realities of the spiritual experience. The mind is then in the region of acquaintance with those realities. Charity is known from affection, theretofore known from doctrine (Arcana, n.8013(2),—see, also n.2417). That is, Swedenborg is pressing with his teaching into the experience of the spiritual life, which is the life of charity, and feels he can call his teaching a "doctrine of charity and faith." He knows that traditional teaching took care of "charity" in a department of "moral theology." Theology proper seemed to have to do with theological propositions. A separate and side department took care of Christian experience. With the Catholic that side department was called "moral theology." With the Protestant it was and is known as "Christian Ethics." But the spiritual life could not so be given its due, he contended (White Horse, n.8(2), New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine, n.257-(2)). Living the Christian life was not a moral result of the Christian faith. Rather it was the main matter of the main body of theology. He intended to make it so. He argued in a pithy phrase for "the *spirituality* of charity" (True Christian Religion, n.796(5e)).

2. Again he knew that charity is the key to so very much. To how much, one begins to get a glimpse if one does no more than run his eye over such statements as the following, all found in "Arcana Cœlestia": It is charity that is the source of the first light of the regenerate life,—truths of faith, which one thinks are the enlightening entity, are only rays of light thence (n.854). Charity is the cause of the multiplication of truth (n.1016(2))—so plainly demonstrated in the fertility of the mind of a man with the spirit of religion, and the bar-

renness relatively and unmovingness of the man of dogmatic belief only. True knowledge, intelligence and wisdom are "sons of charity" (n.1226). The quality of worship is to be traced to one's charity (n.1150). Charity is the inward way into keeping the commandments (n.4263). Yes, it is the inward approach to and entrance on the Word's spiritual sense (n.4632), and is capacity for the spiritual sense (n.3427(2)). Indeed charity is the Lord's presence (n.981(2)), and it is living in Him (n.1735e). Again, let us have the essential definition in mind. The Theological Works are saying these things of the desire to live serviceably. And there are still other passages in which Swedenborg continues this exceedingly high rating of "charity."

3. He again indicates what sweeping significance "charity" has for him in connection with his discussions of the breadth of salvation. It is this getting away from and above oneself by whatever religious help which saves a man. So Gentiles, in whatever falsities, are saved if they have managed charity and mercy in some measure (Arcana, n.845); so Christians (ibid.). Charity bends to truths (n.2280(6)). "All who have lived a life of charity are in heaven" (n.1515e).

4. Or again Swedenborg exhibits the significance which charity has for him when he is on the possible unity of all men in the Lord's sight. Charity is the binding power in variety of thought and teaching. All doctrine whatever *plus* charity is accepted by the Lord (Arcana, n.3452(2e)). Charity makes mistaken conceptions over towards truth (Spiritual Diary, n.4654). It makes pliant minds, and creates teachableness in opinion, where without it a man is rigorous in his dogmatic thought, and impervious to learning more, or better. Here, too, the meaning is not that charity makes for tolerance of another's thought, but for open-mindedness to truth; it is disinterested working of the mind as well as of the spirit; thinking reaches out, as well as purpose, under the desire to live serviceably. Charity is the binding power in varieties of worship (Arcana, n.3241) as in variety of doctrine. It was so in the Ancient Churches (n.6628); it was so in the early Christian Church (n.1834(2)).

5. Swedenborg indicates the deep significance of what he terms charity for the whole Christian experience not only in the four ways named—pointing out its place in the whole body of any vital theology, telling to how much it is the key in religious experience, regarding it especially as the key to the problem of any wide-spread salvation of the children of men, and looking on it as the secret of mankind's unity in the sight of God and in spite of inevitable and indefinite variety of religious thought, and aspiration, and worship. He launched early on a direct eulogy of charity understood as the volitional capacity for living serviceably with all one's powers. That eulogy can well be put with Paul's famous chapter in *Corinthians* on love for one's fellows, or "charity," as that particular passage has been made to read in our English Bible. Let the student read over I *Corinthians,* 13. Then let him pass to this eulogy in the "Spiritual Diary," n.4263. He will want to take note of some other passages, too. Charity *is* the keeping of the Commandments (Arcana, n.1798(2),—see also nn.4776(2), 4783(3). In "Arcana," n.3447, Swedenborg speaks of those who undervalue charity, putting doctrine, though it be doctrine on charity, before life. But the outstanding passage is this from the "Diary". Not seldom such passages go unrepeated in the works published by the Revelator:

> He who is in charity and in true conscience does and knows all the precepts of the Decalog as if from himself . . . all the laws of kingdoms, too. . . . Moreover those in charity and conscience know as it were from themselves all knowledges of faith—they can also as it were from themselves write whole books, and without masters frame whole doctrines. They can preach also all truths and goods. All things are contained in charity.

(To be continued)

William F. Wunsch.

THE LORD'S "GLORIFICATION"

Human imagination seems to be too weak to describe the agony and the despair in which the disciples of Jesus spent the night of the Passover. Some hours earlier their beloved mas-

ter and leader had expired on the cross. Few of the disciples witnessed the disheartening scene, as the cross was lifted up to the clouding sky, and the last words came from the lips of a fast failing body.

And as kind hands provided a safe place to rest the earthly remains of Jesus of Nazareth, the bravest followed to the rock tomb, which Joseph of Arimathea, a man of standing, had dedicated.

> Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new tomb wherein was never man yet laid. There then because of the Jew's "preparation" (for the tomb was nigh at hand) they laid Jesus. (John xix, 41, 42.)

Several of the disciples, who had fled after the arrest of the Lord, had hidden themselves in Jerusalem, and not even witnessed the crucifixion. Bravest among them all were the women who followed the Lord. They, although not present during the hour of trial in Gethsemane, courageously followed, the Roman guards notwithstanding, and provided enough comfort for the Lord, as He bore the cross to Golgotha, "the place of a skull." Compassionate women were closest to the cross. Their love for the Lord could not be barred out by any earthly power. In the hour of combat and of trouble we value affectionate love the most. In the hour of crisis the courage of love is strongest, the persistence of tender sympathy most welcome.

The admiration of the women who followed the Lord had changed into determined fondness. Now, since the spirit and the spark in the eyes of Jesus were gone, the body remained to be courteously and graciously tended to.

The night vigil of the Christians in Jerusalem following the day of crucifixion was never recorded. But we may be sufficiently sure that not one slept. With consternation and restlessness they awaited the dawn. Many times their eyes scanned the nocturnal sky to discover the first lighter shade in the East. The rising stars shimmered as brightly as before. The cool air which streamed down over the city from the hill Scopus made them draw their tunics closer. Words of lamentation they muttered. Tears of grief they shed.

Finally the horizon shaded into a violet gray. Silver tints poured forth; the hues of the emerald followed and climbed the lofty dome, while the fading stars retreated into the West. Now, an orange flame began to paint the Eastern horizon with cheerful lustre.

It was time to rise and visit the sepulchre. Mary of Magdala and the Mother of James had planned to go the earliest, in order to prepare the body for its long rest. With the disappearing stars, the Jewish sabbath ended, and work could be resumed. Last afternoon the body had to be laid hurriedly in the grave. But now the spices proper to the burial and the ointments customary in Judea had to be applied.

In the flow of the tender oil, the sympathy of Mary would again pour from its deep fountain. In the gentle touch of her hands she wanted to express for the last time her everlasting gratitude to the Man who had drawn her out of the mire of prostitution in Magdala.

Now late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day in the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. (Matthew xxvii, 1.)

And when the sabbath was past Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Salome bought spices that they might come and anoint him. And very early on the first day of the week, they come to the tomb when the sun was risen. (Mark xvi, 1, 2.)

With a little lighter heart, cheered by the first beams of the rising sun, they approached the tomb. Doubting whether they could remove the heavy stone that was rolled in front of the cave, they hastened their steps, but utter amazement halted them.

They see that the stone is rolled back: for it was exceeding great. And entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe; and they were amazed. And he saith unto them Be not amazed: ye seek Jesus the Nazarene, who hath been crucified: he is risen: he is not here: behold, the place where they laid him! But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. And they went out, and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them: and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid. (Mark xvi, 4-8.)

Expecting to find the tomb closed with a heavy, almost immovable rock, they beheld it open!

Expecting to find the frail body of Jesus, hastily rolled in a few linen clothes, they come upon a youth clad in snowy white.

Expecting to do the last tender service to the cherished friend, they find themselves face to face with a situation so puzzling that they flee in terror.

Fear and awe had overwhelmed them. For there where they expected to see death and decay, they found the message of a living hope. The white youth speaking words of expectation came like the first rays of the rising sun into the tomb of their buried hopes. "He is risen." Jesus, the beloved Son of man, was risen, Jesus, the gracious teacher, sent a message of an approaching reunion. Jesus, the disappeared, promised to be their companion again!

His work seemed to be so abruptly ended! In the midst of his triumph over the literalism of the Pharisees and the mercenary desires of the temple managers, he fell under the blow of the ruling church. Courageously he had carried his message right into the center of the foul and decaying church. In Jerusalem, upon the wide square of Herod's temple, he preached the truth of life. With gnashing teeth the Scribes listened to his stirring message. With bitter hatred the Pharisees found themselves defeated in numerous intellectual duels. The superior board, the Sanhedrin, council of the nationalistic church, took decisive steps. Like lightning the arm of Mosaic law stretched out and struck the man who disquieted so many people with new teachings.

The work of the Lord was ended. The blow dealt by the Israelitic church was not before the time. The earthly achievement was not prematurely halted. In the garden of Gethsemane the last conflict was fought and victoriously ended. The agony on the cross was only the last manifestation of the inward victory over the body. The Easter morning was the first sign of the glory now dwelling in the Lord. He was devoid of space and time limitations. The struggle lasting for years had moulded a soul and a mind which mastered the

earthly substructure! Ended was the conflict, glorified the Son of man! All human limitations were laid aside! The rising Easter sun witnessed a completed task.

A complete accomplishment was the life of the Lord on earth. From this point of view we want to view the Easter effects. The very end of the personal experiences of Jesus was a Divine victory over self. After he had slowly overcome the lighter lures of the basic human nature which made him a Son of man, he gradually overcame by continuous struggles and temptation-combats the more severe appetities which demanded from him abandonment of the ministry, and acceptance of the offered kingship of Israel as an earthy nation. But slight were these demands of the lust to rule over others, or to possess the goods of others. Deeper he had to bow his head in order to accomplish the task which he had set before him, guided by the Divine light that was in him.

Hatred he had rejected long ago in his early youth. But the subtle force which makes nationalism so intolerant, pride of race, had to be uprooted. How long had it maintained a hold in him? Really how long? Until the time that he found faith in the Syro-Phoenician woman! A few months before he gave his life for his friends he regarded himself a prophet to Israel only. But a deeper conjunction with the inward guide, the Divine working out in the human, made him realize the narrowness of his message. The continuous struggles and the continuous victories of the noble, the world-wide, the universal and the unselfish (in other words, of the Divine) over the base, the narrow, the local and the self-centered (in other words, the human) are the precious achievements of the Lord. His activities on earth were an uninterrupted overcoming of the hells.

These are the hells: racial pride coupled with intolerance and narrowness in all matters of belief and personal opinion; externalism, the tyranny of all those who love to cover their inward weakness and their false pretenses; literalism, the exhibition of the provincial mind, which also inhabits cities, to make the world stick to the formulas of by-gone days; insincerity, the arch-fiend of all those who seek personal advantage, and to whom proper standing in the community counts for more

than a true and genuine conviction; tyranny, or the love of ruling, the lowest of all earthly urges, which brings misery to millions the year round; false ambition, the trouble with the immature mind, seeking fame, a remnant of childhood days; covetousness, a desire retained from jungle conditions, and not overcome yet; and so many, many more he overcame.

He did so by letting the outward, the human, be humiliated to the lowest degree possible before all personal life had vanished. Pride, individual independence, self-reliance, self-guidance, were reduced to the minimum of influence and weight in matters of choice. Deceit and hate, anger and falseness, hypocrisy and the sword, he replaced in himself by the true and genuinely human features of forgiveness and truthfulness, self-mastery and veracity, frankness and good will. In gradually stamping out the constant tendencies of the animalistic nature, he made room for the ennobling and redeeming desires of the Divine nature. This expanding of the Divine into the human finally completed the capture and extinction of the hereditary and constitutional structure of the emotional and intellectual human. This progressive achievement is known as the glorification of the Lord, and is the deepest thought in Swedenborg's theology. To quote from him:

> The union of the Lord's human essence with His Divine essence was not affected at once . . . but through the whole course of His life from infancy to the last of His life in the world. Thus He ascended continually to glorification, that is, union. (n. 2033.)

The Easter events are the direct outcome of this glorification, which was not only a purification but a complete regeneration. The hereditary and constitutional nature, obtained from the mother, was "put off." Instead, the indwelling, self-creative and intrinsic nature took possession of the individual life, known to man as Jesus of Nazareth. Thus the essential and elemental, the Divine, glorified the experiential and created, the human.

The trembling, the astonishment and the fear of the women coming to the tomb are amply justified by the events which testify of the awe-creating mental achievement in the Lord. The powers set free by His complete victory were sufficient to

throw any human being into terror. The goal He had reached, in a persistent and genuinely intelligent effort to transform human nature, and to create a human personality which could live on forever as the supreme human personality. The goal now stands out over centuries as the continuously challenging, but never reached, mark.

On Easter day, we all look with the same awe and the same admiration up to the Son of man, who threw Himself wholeheartedly and full of trust into an adventure which resulted in a complete re-created human personality. Today the Christian adventure is the outstanding challenge to any courageous and persistent human being. Buddhistic contemplation, Mohammedan utter obedience, Shinto reverence, must fade before the call of Christ, our Lord, who beckons us to follow Him to this adventure of rebuilding one's character. The ideal man, the ideal character, the Lord Himself sketched and presented continually during His earthly career. Regeneration of the human is the life-task of the genuine and new Christian.

The Easter effects speak of the ultimate success of the Lord to achieve the goal. The emptiness of the tomb, the amazement of the women, witness to us that this is historical truth.

The Lord rose out of the darkness of the tomb, as the Easter sun rose from the black hills of the desert. One humanity may rise out of the darkness and the despair of our hereditary and constitutional errors and spiritual lifelessness into regeneration and inner power.

Today our admiration and our praise for the victory achieved rise from humble hearts to Thee, O Glorified Lord. We stand in awe and joy before the empty tomb of hopelessness, humiliation, and fear, and rejoice in knowing that Thou hast won, that Thou hast overcome. In Thine ancient sacrifice, O Lord, we believe. Help our unbelief in ourselves. Lift us out of the tomb, as Thou hast lifted up Thyself. Let us obtain a little of the glory which warms man's heart, a little of the glory of which Thou wast so sure, speaking these words to Thy disciples: "I have glorified thee on earth; I have accomplished the work which thou gavest me to do." OTHMAR TOBISCH.

CURRENT LITERATURE

A NEW STUDY OF SWEDENBORG'S TRANSITION PERIOD*

The opening paragraph of Rev. Mr. Acton's recent book entitled "An Introduction to the Word Explained" begins with the words:

> The work now presented to the public for the first time in English dress, or indeed in any complete translation, has been known in the past by the title "Adversaria" bestowed upon it by Dr. J. F. Immanuel Tafel, in 1842, when he commenced the publication of the Latin text.

This sentence obviously does not apply to the volume before us, but announces as though accomplished the contemplated publication of a complete translation of Swedenborg's "Adversaria" of which as yet no part has appeared in bound form.† As the prefatory remarks are continued, we are given an account of the manuscripts that are included in that work as put through the press in Latin by Dr. Tafel, and how he came to publish them as he did, and the reason for the title "Adversaria"; and we are told that the contemplated translation is to be made from a phototype reproduction of the manuscripts themselves, and not from Tafel's Latin. The change in title is explained as due to the fact that Swedenborg at about that time referred to these manuscripts as his "Spiritual Exposition"; and that in sundry places he indicated that his idea of a title for the work as a whole was that of "The Word

*_An Introduction to the Word Explained;_ a study of the means by which Swedenborg the scientist and philosopher became the theologian and revelator. By Alfred Acton, M.A., D. Th., Dean of the Theological School of the Academy of the New Church. Bryn Athyn, Pa.: Academy of the New Church. 1927. 164 pp., 8vo. $2.00.

†Vol. I of the translation has just been published.—Ed.

Explained." With some additional information concerning previous translations of parts of the entire work, the two initial sections of this Introduction come to a close. As they seem to contain everything that a reader would usually like to know and expect to find before undertaking the reading of the translation itself, the question naturally arises, Why more?

These manuscripts were written by Swedenborg in the period from 1745 to 1747, subsequent to the opening of his spiritual senses and to the definite giving of his "call." There is good evidence that at the outset he contemplated the publication of what he was about to write; but he changed his mind. As he did not destroy what he had written, it has been reproduced for all posterity. The student of Swedenborg naturally wishes to know the worth of this preliminary work of the great revelator; and it is because Dr. Acton is of the opinion that it cannot be properly evaluated without adequate knowledge of Swedenborg's life up to the year 1749, that he prepared the third chapter of his Introduction, running from page 17 to page 118, as really the most important part of it.

This chapter of one hundred pages is entitled "Swedenborg's Intromission into the Spiritual World"; and it is devoted mainly to the decade between 1740 and 1750. Every person who has attempted to write a biography of Swedenborg has had to deal with that period; but no one else has ever attempted to deal with it with the same thoroughness as Mr. Acton. And we may add that, without the facilities at the disposal of Mr. Acton, no one else could have done it with the same thoroughness.

Though this book makes no mention of the fact, there is in the Library of the Academy of the New Church a voluminous loose-leaf file in which has been placed in exact chronological order every scrap of information concerning Swedenborg's life thus far ascertained. All new information is promptly put in the proper place; and this biographical reservoir is still growing. All this matter was at Dr. Acton's service while preparing this third chapter of his Introduction. It shows clearly

that there was no sharp break in Swedenborg's life into two distinct parts, as has sometimes been implied, but that his life must be considered strictly as a unity with a quite unique development, especially during the time we are considering. In order to effect His Second Coming, and to give to humanity a new body of revealed truth of such a nature as to be placarded with the words "Nunc Licet", the Lord had to prepare a suitable living instrument for that purpose; and that preparation involved a considerable period of time. Swedenborg himself tells us that in later life he could trace the hand of Divine Providence in a guiding way to this end throughout his earlier years; and in view of this statement Mr. Acton finds it necessary to give some consideration not only to Swedenborg's heredity but especially to incidents in Swedenborg's experience previous to 1740.

It is needless here to specify the various biographical topics taken up by Mr. Acton in this connection. Suffice to say that nothing of importance is omitted, and that considerable attention is given to making known just what Swedenborg was busy about in an entirely normal way, and how he appeared to his associates, during the prolonged period of preparation when he was also having quite unusual experiences of a supernormal character. On this subject Mr. Acton has the following to say:

> We have purposely dwelt at some length on the contents of Swedenborg's writings at this period. So firmly impressed is it, even on the minds of members of the New Church, that during the opening of his spiritual eyes Swedenborg was in a more or less abnormal physical condition, with his mind deeply disturbed, that it seems necessary to describe in some detail the literary work which he was carrying on during the whole of this period; work that required not only a comprehensive grasp of facts, but also the greatest mental concentration, or, to use Swedenborg's own words, "long and deep thought, and a mind unencumbered by cares and troubles." It would be an actual impossibility for a man in a constant state of mental disturbance and excitement to pen the works that Swedenborg penned during this period,—works which testify to the exhaustive researches made by their author, to his keen and undiminished power of logical analysis,

and to the profound penetration of his thought. To recognize this, one needs but to read the works themselves. (P. 84.)

Approached in its order in the course of this detailed study of Swedenborg's life the little treatise on "The Worship and Love of God" has its proper setting and becomes more intelligible. It is the culmination and summing up of the author's philosophic life as he is about to receive that "call" that directs his attention and scholarly energies into new channels. The subject matter and method of treatment are different from any preceding writing; and we may assume that the author, anticipating further guidance, fills part of the time of waiting with the little treatise on this exalted theme. And he seems to have been engaged with the printing of the unfinished third part when the "call" came; and that event probably accounts for the dropping of his pen at this time,—the middle of April 1745.

To Swedenborg's "call," concerning which he has left us almost no information from his own hand, Mr. Acton devotes the last six pages of this most interesting chapter, recounting therein and commenting on the report as given by Robsahm, to whom Swedenborg had evidently spoken somewhat fully.

From the moment of his "call" Swedenborg ceased all labors in the literary fields that had formerly interested him, and turned his attention to the study of the Lord's Word. The time from that happening until the writing of the first volume of the "Arcana Cœlestia" is designated by Mr. Acton as "The Intermediate Period of Swedenborg's Life"; and he devotes nearly thirty pages to its consideration, as chapter four of this work. It was during this period that Swedenborg wrote what he called his "Spiritual Exposition", the translation of which into English by Dr. Acton is now under way.

Early in his consideration of Swedenborg's biography, Dr. Acton quoted one sentence from Wm. W. Ireland's book entitled "Through the Ivory Gate", in which that author attempts to demonstrate that Swedenborg was mentally unsound. The sentence reads:

A slight study ought to convince one that either Swedenborg was

subject to delusion and hallucinations, or that his pretensions to commune with the dead and his claim to announce a new revelation were really founded on truth. To admit the latter would entail the admission of the truth of a new religion. (P.2.)

Dr. Acton takes up the challenge involved in this statement, and by his detailed analysis of Swedenborg's life and labors during the period we have been considering, gives abundant evidence in disproof of the conclusions of Dr. Ireland,—evidence most illuminating, showing that for the Lord's instrument for a new revelation a long preparation in scientific and philosophy ways such as Swedenborg had, was necessary; that the opening of his spiritual senses, and his voluminous experiences on the spiritual plane under the guidance and protection of the Lord, were also necessary; that the acquisition of a knowledge of correspondences, and a mastery of the Bible, were likewise requisite; and that a life involving these things would inevitably be exceptional from the psychologist's standpoint, but not on that account disordered.

We have but one adverse comment to make on this book; not on its contents, but on a typographic feature of it,—the quite erratic way in which quotation marks are used or omitted throughout the volume. The constant use of them wherever called for would have contributed materially to the clearness of the presentation as a whole, as to the authorship of its various parts.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

A NEW HISTORY OF THE JEWS

It is commonplace to say, when considering the history of the Jews, that their survival as a distinguishable people without territory or government, is a phenomenon absolutely unique Yet of all those who have repeated the remark there can have been but few who could make it intelligently. Graetz's *"Geschichte der Juden"* is in eleven volumes, and even in its English translation is scarcely a work which one would be likely to peruse without a very special interest in the subject. The real

need for a briefer treatment has finally been met by the book* before us.

Within the compass of a single volume Messrs. Margolis and Marx have unfolded the story of the Jews from the days of the patriarchs to the foundation of the Jewish University in Palestine. It follows their fortunes through all the lands where they have established themselves. The book is well equipped with a good bibliography, an index, careful chronological tables, and a set of maps. For all its bulk it is neither heavy nor clumsy.

The Christian reader of such a book, besides his interest in the subject itself, is likely to be interested in three particular questions: (1) How is the treatment of the history of Old Testament times affected by modern Bible study? (2) How is Jesus regarded? (3) What is the attitude toward the Christians amongst whom the Jews have had to live for so many centuries?

One scarcely knows whether to praise or to blame the handling of Old Testament history. The authors are well aware of the results of modern research in this field; but so skilful is the presentation that it would be quite possible for a reader with strong prejudices either for tradition or for criticism to read the book without being roused to protest. One must perforce admire the skill; but one may question the wisdom of such a compromise.

About two pages are given to the life of Jesus. The story begins with His baptism by John, and ends, naturally enough, with the crucifixion. Within those limits the teaching and work of Jesus, and His relation to contemporaneous Judaism, are presented with all fairness and sympathy. Christians might want to say more, but they would find it hard to say better what has been said.

It is hard to say what is the most disgraceful aspect of the history of Christianity, but surely one of the worst has been

---

**A History of the Jewish People.* By Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America. 1927. 870 pp., 8vo. $4.00.

Christian persecution of the Jews. So persistent and so widespread has it been, that it could not be omitted from any account of their history. And if an historian is ever justified in being bitter, it is the Jewish writer on the history of his own race in Europe during the Middle Ages. Yet the spirit in which these necessary details are recounted is worthy of the Founder of Christianity Himself. We have much to learn from the Jews and their history,—and not least in importance to us is what is told us about those called Christians.

FREDERIC R. CROWNFIELD.

"THE GALILEAN ACCENT"

Arthur John Gossip has published a volume of sermons, spoken in a direct and effective way by one who has a strong Christian faith and a sympathetic knowledge of human nature, with its high possibilities, its weaknesses, and its discouragements. The sermons assume the living presence of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Source of Christian strength, and stimulate to more loyal discipleship and larger realization of Christian blessings. The reader is not led into refinements of doctrine, nor into much of Scripture exposition; but the book well justifies its sub-title, "Some Studies in the Christian Life." The preacher (for he seems to be talking to us) is a master of simple language; he talks in short native words. He also draws from a wide range of reading brief reinforcements of the truth which he is stating.

The first of the twenty sermons, "The Galilean Accent,"* dealing with the unconscious qualities which reveal the Christian life, gives its title to the volume. Among titles which follow, are: "Why You and I Are Here"; "The God of Human Experience"; "How Christ Won Through"; "How Spring Comes to the Soul"; "On a Wise Prodigality"; and "On a Primary Law of Spiritual Success."

**The Galilean Accent: Some Studies in the Christian Life.* By ARTHUR JOHN GOSSIP, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926. 294 pp., 8vo. $2.50.

One will wish to read one sermon at a time, and to pause to give expression to its impulse to deeper Christian living. The manner of the sermons will be instructive to those who wish to learn simple and effective ways of preaching. The volume is one of "The Scholar as Preacher" series.

WM. L. WORCESTER.

TALKS TO CHILDREN

The average minister has neglected talks for children. It is easy to discern, however, that he will no longer continue to do so, as many pastors are studying the art of addressing children. The difficulty the minister experiences in bringing down his thoughts to the level of the child's mind is especially noticeable to himself, and probably also to his congregation on Children's Sunday.

A very helpful book in meeting this difficulty is Rev. Frank J. Scribner's, "The Portion for the Children."* It does not give an exposition of the art of addressing children, but consists of fifty-two talks of the pastor with the children of his congregation.

Each talk is short, and is divided into two parts—the story and the application: the former, a vivid narrative taken from everyday life, comprising the bulk of the talk; and the latter, a short application, which is sometimes not reserved for the conclusion, but woven into the story.

One example, taken from the seventh chapter, is typical. Mr. Scribner here gives a delightful little talk on animals, in which he asks the children if they have ever seen the hippo's large mouth and small ears; also the elephant's large ears and concealed mouth. He goes on:

> Sometimes I see a boy or girl who makes me say to myself, "There's a hippopotamus." Lots of talk, not much listen; plenty of mouth, not

**Portion for the Children;* a pastor's talks with the children of his congregation. By Rev. Frank J. Scribner. New York: Macmillan. 1927. 182 pp., 12mo. $1.75.

much ear. Do you wonder that they make me think of the hippopotamus?

But there are elephants, too, among humans. There are people who can talk when it is time to talk; but who know that we have two ears and only one mouth, and that it is usually safe to give at least twice as much work to our ears as we give to our mouth.

JEDEDIAH EDGERTON.

"THE JESUIT ENIGMA"*

Much has been written about the Jesuits: much that is unduly favorable and laudatory by the Jesuits themselves; much that is deeply critical and condemnatory, mostly by others, but in part by those who have been Jesuits, and have written with full knowledge, both favorable and unfavorable, of the subject. The book before us—"The Jesuit Enigma" by E. Boyd Barrett—is one of the latter kind, and the most recent. Why the author should have written such a book, though briefly stated in the Preface, is not made clear until the final chapter, entitled "From Dreams to Disillusionment," which is autobiographic in nature. That chapter is rightly named, telling how as a lad in his teens young Barrett had idealized the Order, set his heart on entering it, spent years until his majority in preparing for and anticipating admission to it, and finally, after twenty years within the Order, was forced out of it in a most reprehensible manner, not because of any misdemeanor or culpability, but because his knowledge and advocacy of "the new psychology" had become such that his Superiors decided that his continuance in the Order would inevitably lead to trouble. As a matter of fact, after having specialized in psychology for several years, Mr. Barrett had come to recognize how prevalent were mental disorders among religious devotees, and had begun to look forward to an extremely useful career within the Order as psychopathic physician, when his hopes were thwarted and dashed by the stupidity of those higher up,

**The Jesuit Enigma.* By E. BOYD BARRETT. New York: Boni and Liveright. 1927. 351 pp., 8vo. $4.00.

who wanted none of it. Did not Acquaviva's treatise on "Instructions for Superiors of the Society in the curing of diseases of the Soul" (written about 1600) completely cover for all time the diagnosing and treatment of all such troubles? But, fearing to eject their expert psychologist while among his own people in Ireland, they craftily held out inducements for him to go to America, assuring him that he would there be able to pursue his specialty and follow his inclinations to the full. Their dishonesty was made manifest to him at once on his arrival. The subsequent steps that led to his withdrawal from the Order (in 1925, when he was forty-one years of age) do not seem at all out of harmony with Jesuitical practices as disclosed in his book.

But why did he write the book? He did it partly to give the world his testimony as to what the Jesuit Order really is inwardly, and partly to help prevent young aspirants to the Order from taking the irreparable step that, in spite of all pretense to the contrary, almost inevitably leads to spiritual wretchedness, because of its devotees' inextricable part in a great mockery. He does this in recognition "that loyalty to Truth stands before loyalty to persons and to fond associations."

The tone of his story is sincere throughout, and practically without bitterness where was so much cause for bitterness. He says of himself in the Preface (p. vii):

> Twenty years of adult manhood is the price I paid for the experiences on which this story is built. No small price! And yet were others to offer as much again, forty years of lifetime, they could not purchase these experiences. For they would be unattainable to any who had not a sincere and pious vocation to live and die in the Order. No one could understand Jesuit obedience unless with firm faith he accepted all the Jesuit doctrine of obedience, and heard distinctly, in the voice of his Superior, as I used to hear, the divine voice of Christ. No one could plumb the depths of Jesuit self-annihilation unless with a holy and heartfelt yearning, he prayed for and sought, as I did, humiliations, sufferings and contempt. Neither could one write a story such as mine, did one, while in the Order, live note-book in hand, jotting down observations for subsequent use. Such an attitude of mind would preclude the possibility of whole-hearted, self-identifi-

cation with the life of a Jesuit. Needless to say, while in the Order, I never dreamed that one day I should, having returned among plain people, write the experience of my sojourn among the children of Ignatius.

Turning now to the treatise itself, we may say that it represents mainly an expert psychologist's analysis of the Jesuit Order, based upon scholarly knowledge of its literature and its history on the one hand, and upon twenty years personal experience within its ranks as a sincere and earnest devotee on the other. The author "pries into the principles that rule the Order, and aims at giving an insight into actual life in the Order" (p. 231), which he elsewhere characterizes (quoting the words of Father Tyrrell, with whom he is in entire sympathy) as "a vast ecclesiastical militia of mentally and morally mediocre men."

The psychologist's point of view is disclosed in the titles of most of his chapters; such as, The Book That Made the Jesuits; The Mind of the Order; Jesuit Espionage; Jesuits and Women; Jesuit Mind-Healing; Jesuit Education; Repression and Explosions; Power and Prestige; The Jesuit Way of Escape. After the historical sketch of the initial chapter, the title of the book appears also as that of the second chapter; but what the author means by the "Jesuit Enigma" is not so well disclosed in that chapter, which deals with but one phase of the subject (that of the violation, by the leaders of the organization, of the fundamental principle of obedience to the Pope), as by the book as a whole; in fact, he elsewhere summarizes in one sentence just what he means by the expression, as follows:

> Once more one is up against the Jesuit enigma, the discrepancy between principles and practice; between the Society of Jesus as it exists in the Constitutions, and the Society as it is in actual life; between the offhand way in which it sheds its most sacred rules in the daylight of existence, and the intransigence with which it refuses to displace a comma of its inspired Koran. (P. 144.)

That is the real subject of the volume, which is the work of a trained scholar of excellent ability and fine nature. It abounds in pertinent quotations, mostly from Roman Catholic

and Jesuit authorities, some of which, such as the "Catholic Encyclopedia," are readily accessible.

As the author approaches the close of his treatise, and before dwelling in detail upon his personal experiences, he gives several pages to the somewhat similar case of Father George Tyrrell. He there quotes Tyrrell as saying:

> I entered the Society not only with full belief that it still was what it had been at first, but with a strong bias to find things as I expected . . . . I entered what I thought was a Society devoted to the progressive and expansive interest, and I found myself in one sworn to the cause of reaction and intransigence. (P. 274.)

Summing up about Tyrrell he says:

> Tyrrell parted from the Society of Jesus because he felt convinced that the Order was no longer 'laboring in the vineyard' of Christ. He did not seek any dispensations from his vows, because he believed that his vows were non-existent. He had, he felt, been substantially deceived in the making of the vows; and the Society was entirely to blame for this deception. (P. 282.)

The reactionary attitude of the Jesuits mentioned above is perhaps best shown by their hostility to modern thought, especially as militating against the traditional Roman Catholic positions and scholastic thought generally. In view of what Dr. Barrett says about this, and about the power of the Jesuits at Rome, the suspicion arises that perhaps, in final analysis, they are accountable for the Pope's encyclical against modernism, as issued a score of years ago, as well as the earlier decree (1870) with regard to the infallibility of the Pope. A few sentences from Dr. Barrett's book will be of interest in this connection:

> In 1883 the General Congregation declared: "Since the Society of Jesus has decreed the utility of the philosophy of Aristotle for the ends of theology, we are to adhere to it in accordance with the requisitions laid down in the Statutes, and in the scheme of studies; and this, not only in logic and metaphysics, but also in Natural Philosophy, from which Aristotle's teaching as to the nature and composition of natural bodies must not be omitted. If the Provincial Superiors discover that modernisers deviate from this pholosophy either openly or under specious pretences, and attempt to put other views in their place they are to be deprived of their teaching office."

It is reiterated in various places that philosophy is to be regarded as the handmaid of theology. Thus, the Third General Congregation decreed: "The professors of philosophy are to teach philosophy in such manner that it be the handmaid and servant of Scholastic theology which is commended to us by our Constitutions." Again and again Superiors are reminded that Professors of Philosophy who are "disposed towards innovations of free thinking" are to be removed from office. "Since novelty or difference of opinion may not only hinder the very aim which the Society has set before itself to the greater glory of God, but also cause the very existence of the Society to totter, it is necessary to check by definite legislation in all possible ways intellectual license (*licentiam ingeniorum*), in the introduction and pursuit of such opinions". (Pp. 174-5.)

Dr. Barrett says of his own experience:

The Jesuit professors of Milltown had apparently a supreme contempt for modern research and modern Bible criticism. They regarded theology as being a fixed and completed science which could not be overthrown and which could not be perfected. (P. 319.)

In his chapter on "Reminiscences and Reflections" Dr. Barrett stresses the fact that the Jesuit Order is subjected to a self-perpetuating aristocratic government, arrogant and ambitious, that is quite out of harmony with the spirit of Christ. While the body draws its recruits from the finest and noblest young men within its reach,—youths who respond whole-heartedly to the ideal of consecrating themselves to the service of the Lord and the betterment of mankind,—a separation among them comes in due time, the few who seem suitably qualified and inclined being taken into the number of those who unitedly rule, while by far the larger part, but little changed in their innate nature by their religious discipline, are added to the rank and file, who tend to shirk the requirements of that discipline more and more,* and finally relapse into a resigned hope-

*It was the widespread discrepancy between the ideals of the Society, as described in Jesuit literature, and the actual practices in vogue in the Order that for years proved an insoluble puzzle to me. But the puzzle was eventually solved, though too late for my peace of mind, when I found that the vast majority of so-called Jesuits lived in open repudiation of the tenets of Jesuitism, while those who professed Jesuitism fell far short in their practices of its ascetical demands. It

lessness, shackled to the system, and more or less hypocritically obsequious to the wills of their Superiors. And the prevailing spirit of the more powerful of those Superiors, whose word to the rank and file is theoretically the word of Christ, aims at increased domination. While it is highly improbable that the vision of Loyola with regard to the Order he fathered extended to include world dominion for that Order, there can be no doubt that the ruling element among his followers has caught and cherished that possibility. If one can be the power behind the throne, it is not necessary to sit upon the throne in order to rule; and there are advantages in being behind rather than on the throne. So the Jesuit Order, as "a church within the Church",—or rather, so the small governing body of Jesuit Superiors, more than any other agency, is directing the course of Roman Catholic ambition in civic as well as religious ways. We need not here enter into details; but let us hear what our author says about their growing power in the purposes of this country:

An interesting proof of Jesuit prestige and power in this country is the existence, in the shadow of the Capitol, at Washington, of the Jesuit School for Foreign Service, opened a few years ago through the instrumentality of an Irish-American, Fr. Edmund Walsh, S. J. At this school of diplomatic service, said to be the largest of its kind in America, young Americans are trained to guide the future fortunes of the Republic. Already several alumni of this school hold important positions in consulates throughout the world. . . .

I have no reason to doubt that American Jesuits are individually loyal to their country; but one cannot forget the words of the Pope, Clement XIV, who accused them of *"rising up against the very kings who admitted them into their country."* The fact remains, whatever interpretations may be put upon it, that the Jesuits have attained to such prestige and power in this country that they have been able to lay hands upon the most delicate and nationally important form of education, in spite of a record which little justifies confidence in their worthiness for such work. It is no doubt an edifying spectacle for

---

is interesting to notice in the Order how "class-consciousness" is felt. The ruling class tend to gravitate more and more to certain definite houses, and the rank and file have a social life of their own about which the other class knows comparatively little. (Barrett, P. 290.)

other Orders to see Jesuits, who by rule "have nothing whatever to do with secular or political affairs", in charge of a school of diplomacy and foreign service.

The power of the Society of Jesus in the Catholic Church is beyond doubt enormous. It is said, apparently with truth, that the Jesuit General, the "Black Pope" as he is called, can make and unmake bishops and even cardinals. He has various agents and representatives within the walls of the Vatican, and he can gain the ear of the Pope whenever he wishes . . . . Again and again the Society has been able to oppose successfully the plans and wishes of Popes. . . .

The secret, however, of the strength of the Society in the Catholic Church lies in the phrase used by Fr. Tyrrell, *"ecclesia in ecclesiam"* (a church within a church). In this pregnant phrase the position of the Society is summed up. The Order is to the Church what the Church is to the world. The Order is a kind of parasite sucking the vital power of the Church . . . . It holds the confidence and consciences of so many bishops, cardinals, and prelates; gives so many priests and nuns retreats; directs, through its theologians, so many pious organizations; in fine, works in so many ways on the functionaries of the Church, that it has become as it were an inner circle in the Church. It has made the Church more reactionary, and more absolute through centralization. It has aimed not unsuccessfully at the Jesuitizing of the Church. It has made the Pope more and more like its own autocratic General; and has reduced the bishops more and more to the status of Provincials in the Society who are officials nominated by and controlled by the General, without any inherent authority.

The Society has been able, whenever it determined to do so, to worm its way into the heart of affairs. We have just seen how it has made itself count in Washington, by its School of Foreign Service. It has less difficulty in making itself count at Rome, and in winning the position of *preceptor morum* of the Catholic Church. So to speak it regards it as its right and duty to keep the Church in order, to direct its spirit, to chaperon the Popes, to fulfil its divine mission of ruling the Church from without and from within. It is the supreme manifestation of its Superiority Complex. Itself, it is *ex lex*. It gets itself dispensed from every enactment of Canon Law, or General Council, or Papal Decree that impinges on its "revealed" Constitutions. It interferes in everything. It admonishes everyone. It denounces whatever it disapproves of. One thing it never has done, and apparently never will do, and that is "toe the line" with other Orders of the Church. (P.p. 218-220.)

The world owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Barrett for the disclosures of this book. B. A. WHITTEMORE.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

¶ A cheap, well illustrated and concise life of Emanuel Swedenborg.
¶ Suitable for the use of all the Societies and Missionary Institutions of the Church.

The MISSIONARY AND TRACT SOCIETY of London begs to announce the republication of the

"LIFE OF SWEDENBORG"

By the late J. Stuart Bogg. Revised by Rev. H. G. Drummond.
5 x 7½ inches; 40 pages and paper cover; 15 illustrations.
Price Threepence, postage extra, (say 10c. postpaid).
Order of NEW-CHURCH PRESS, Ltd.,
1, Bloomsbury Street, London, W. C. 1, England

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room, 117 So. High St.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.
Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.
New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland, 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

CLARENCE W. BARRON, *President*,
GEORGE C. WARREN,
JAMES E. YOUNG, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.